HISTORY

JULY, 1916.

THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF CONSTANTINOPLE.[1]

In much recent historical writing there is a constant tendency for the individual to wither and for the world in which he moves to grow more and more: a man is alike produced, conditioned, and explained by the general forces which fashion the life of his day. But there are some intractable individualities which refuse to be suppressed: in their own persons they mark a new beginning which is not merely the sum of that which went before; and among the first of these are the founders of great cities. If Alexander's sole achievement had been the creation of Alexandria, his fame would have been imperishable, and in the same way Constantine, whom men have rightly called the Great, lives to-day in the city which still bears his name. It is of Constantinople, as the capital of a Christian Empire, that I would speak for a short space this afternoon; but this Christian capital was superimposed upon a pagan city, and thus we cannot ignore altogether the story of Byzantium before it became New Rome.

If some potent genie were to appear before us and offer to bear us on his magic carpet into any period of history that we might choose, I suspect that not a few would ask to be transported to Miletus in the eighth or early seventh century before Christ, the time when the city under its adventurous aristocratic rulers had begun its enterprise of far-flung colonisation, when its pioneer merchants, deserting the island screen of the Asian coast and the island stepping-stones across the Ægean, worked up against the current that met them through the Dardanelles, crossed the Mar-

[1] A public lecture delivered at University College, London, on May 24, 1916. I have refrained from adding references, as these will find their place more naturally in a monograph, which I hope eventually to publish, on Popular Life and Thought in the East Roman Empire.—N. H. B.

HISTORY

JULY, 1916.

THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

mora, threaded the Bosphorus, and braved the unfriendly storm-tossed Euxine. We would see those early settlements coming into being which Russian archæologists have recently excavated —the settlements whence was shipped the corn for a hungry Greece. It was in fact the reconquest of that trade for which, as Dr. Leaf has suggested, the Achaeans through ten long years besieged the walls of Troy, until they captured the city which barred the passage to the land of wealth east of the Hellespont. During the eighth century B.C. the Milesians studded the north coast of Asia Minor with their factories, but Thrace still remained for them a barbarous country, where the sailor landed at his peril. When Milesians, however, had once pointed the way, others could follow, and in 685 B.C., as our tradition says, Chalcedon was founded, at the entrance of the Bosphorus, on the Asian shore, opposite the harbour which was to be known as the Golden Horn. Another seventeen years passed before the site of Byzantium was occupied by Greek settlers. To Megabazus, the Persian satrap, as he compared the position of the two cities, it might appear that the Chalcedonians were indeed blind to have neglected so magnificent a situation; but in their own day the colonists had perhaps a good excuse, for on the land side the fields of Byzantium until Roman times lay open to Thracian inroads, and the early settlers were planting, not the capital of a world Empire, but an agricultural colony. Byzantium, once founded, controlled the passage to the Euxine: the Milesians had created the reason for that foundation; the site of Byzantium, in fact, as Mr. Minns has shown, had little value until the Milesians had called into existence the Black Sea trade.

From the first the city's wonderful harbour pointed to maritime development. In the sixth century B.C., like other Greek colonies, Byzantium became subject to the Persian Empire, and its ships took part in the Scythian expedition of Darius. When a few years later, at the beginning of the fifth century, the Ionian Greeks revolted against Persian rule, the insurgents occupied Byzantium; and as the tide of success turned in favour of Persia, Histiæus, the soul of that revolt, induced the Mityleneans to lend him ships, and with these he sailed to Byzantium: the key city must by all means be held for the Greek cause. On the failure of the insurrection the inhabitants fled, and Phœnician sailors in Persian pay burned Byzantium. It was captured from the Persians by Pausanias, the Spartan general, after the victories of Salamis and Platæa, and was repeopled with Athenian and Spartan settlers. Here Pausanias installed himself as tyrant in

despite of the protests of the Spartan Government, until the Athenians wrested the city from him in 470: for Attica, dependent on foreign grain, the control of the passage to the Euxine was essential; had not Solon sought the solution of Attica's economic problem in fostering the cultivation of the olive, and in the encouragement of the manufacture of pottery on a large scale? The olive oil of Attica, exported in Athenian jars, the work of skilled Athenian potters, should provide the means whereby Attica would purchase the corn of Southern Russia: if a hostile power held Byzantium and the Dardanelles, it also held the key to the wheat-fields of Olbia (Odessa); that is why Gallipoli—the Thracian Chersonese—was at an early date occupied by Athens. When Athens lost the control of the Dardanelles at the battle of Ægospotami (405) her Empire was at an end.

So when sixty years later Philip of Macedon was preparing the way for complete mastery of Greece, he realised that the surest means to serve his end was to win Byzantium. The Greek cities must then come to him, like Joseph's brethren, to buy their bread. Demosthenes, on his side, saw the danger, and carried through an alliance between Athens and Byzantium. The siege of the city was one of the most famous in all antiquity: Leon of Byzantium devoted to the subject seven books; but Athens and Byzantium won the day. Seldom, it has been said, has oratory had so brilliant a justification.

Alexander left the autonomy of Byzantium untouched, and in the Hellenistic period the tunny-fish metropolis, as Archestratus called the city, was the rival of Rhodes in commercial prosperity. While Rhodes incurred Rome's mistrust and saw its pride of place pass to Delos, Byzantium retained Roman favour and under the early Empire became a great walled fortress. At the end of the second century of our era, however, the city obstinately supported the rival of Septimius Severus, and after a desperate siege, which lasted from the winter of 193–4 to the summer of 196, lost her freedom and her city rights, while her walls were levelled to the ground. It was a disastrous revenge for the Empire: the sea-passage was thus open to the invading Goths.

How came it then that the disgraced city was raised some hundred years later to be the second capital of the Roman world? To such a question there is obviously no single answer, but a few suggestions at least may be offered towards the solution of the problem.

Rome had grown great as a State of peasant farmers, but

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/history_1916-07_1_2

with the extension of Roman power the revenues of Rome expanded: when the Hellenistic kingdoms, which had been formed by the successors of Alexander the Great, became subject to the Republic which was fast becoming an Empire, the tribute of the East poured into Rome, and with this wealth her citizens purchased the luxuries of the Græco-Oriental world. But the danger of all luxuries is ever that imperceptibly they become necessities and the standard of living rises generally in all classes. Thus the time came when Italy did not produce enough to pay for her imports, and so the balance of trade turned in favour of the East, and Italy was forced to purchase the rich textiles, the spices, the slaves of the Orient in hard cash, and this meant a ruinous drain of specie. Italy became impoverished, since Rome had never been a natural centre of commerce, for the Tiber is a treacherous stream, and Ostia at its mouth an unsatisfactory harbour. Commercial superiority followed the ebb tide, and flowed towards the East.

The third century of our era is the period when the Empire was threatened with imminent dissolution; everywhere the barbarian was attacking the frontier, and the Central Power was unequal to the fearful strain. On the Danube Sarmatian and Goth, on the Euphrates the revived Persian power under the Sassanid dynasty, were breaking through the Imperial defences: Rome was too far distant from the points where the danger was greatest. The Empire's need was a capital set between the peril on the eastern and northern boundaries. The military position of the Empire demanded an Eastern metropolis.

In the sphere of religion, too, the third century had seen the victory of the Orient. The cult of the Persian Mithras, of the unconquered Sun, and the faith of the Jew Jesus contended for mastery; and the coldly impersonal and abstract Italian deities were assailed by gods who offered to men conscious of their sinfulness purification and redemption through the shedding of blood. But whether the Saviour was to be Mithras, God of light and truth and purity—the God of Hosts adored by the soldiery—or Christ, the Galilean redeemer, they were both of the East; and before them the Western gods paled their ineffectual fires. The religious centre of the world was in Asia.

So, too, with literature: Latin writers had become purveyors of Court scandal: the historians of Rome were Greeks writing in the Greek language. The last great historian of Rome wrote, as he says, *ut Graecus et miles*. The West was outdistanced in the race.

And then when Diocletian, at the end of the third century, sought to restore the dignity of the throne, he borrowed the Iranian conception of sovereignty as a gift of the Deity, and raised the monarch to a position of lonely and unapproachable splendour: before him men bowed as before a god incarnate, and prostrate kissed the purple of his robe. Yet again the East had conquered. Imperial Italy had sunk to the position of a province. The citizen chief among his fellow-citizens, as Augustus had consistently professed himself, had become the master and lord of his subjects, and his will was the Empire's law.

The Roman State in the later years of Diocletian had sought to suppress Christianity—and failed: Constantine—to whom in the struggle with his rivals Heaven had vouchsafed a vision of the Cross and promised him victory in that sign—in the hour of his triumph took the Christian Church into partnership, and thereby saved the State. That State should have a Christian capital, and with the intuition of genius he fixed on that wonderful position where stood disgraced Byzantium. Byzantium should flower into Constantinople, set where Europe meets Asia, with the peerless harbour which Rome had lacked, guarded by the waters of the Marmora and the Bosphorus, the warden of the sea-way between the Ægean and the Euxine. Thus Constantine recognised that eastward swing of the pendulum which had marked the history of the third century, and set his seal on the union of Roman State and Christian Church, for the symbol of that union is Constantine's city—New Rome.

But when we come to ask ourselves for what Constantinople stood, we are even to-day met by inherited prejudices which still cling to the word Byzantine: for in England the history of East Europe has been in the past strangely neglected, and East Rome, in especial, has been hardly treated. It has, to use a popular term, fallen between two stools. The pure mediævalist can never understand East Rome, for the roots of its civilisation strike deeper than the Christian era, back into the classical past; while the classical student has not cared to understand, because to him the whole story was a chronicle of decline—a civilisation in which the preposition *ἀπὸ* might govern the accusative case was damned outright—why probably many a barbarous Persian who fell at Marathon knew better than that! And the professed historians of East Rome have only helped to propagate Voltaire's judgment that Byzantine history was "a worthless repertory of declamation and miracles disgraceful to the human mind." Lebeau, in the eighteenth century, published his twenty-volumed

Histoire du Bas Empire, and the "Lower Empire" it has remained. Even the insight of Gibbon, our supreme historian—Gibbon who, in Welhausen's pregnant phrase, knew the watersheds of history—even his insight grew less piercing in the closing centuries of the great survey: for him, too, Byzantine annals were a tedious and uniform tale of weakness and misery. Thus our text-books gave us merely the picture of "a vicious and decaying parody of the Roman Empire, eking out its contemptible life on the Bosphorus"; Constantinople had always been in the article of death. But even in the face of oft-repeated iteration we grew incredulous: the Empire took such a mortal long time a-dying; a death agony of a thousand years seemed positively indecent. Of course the fact is that the Empire persisted in demonstrating that it was very much alive. The wonder of East Rome is its ever-recurrent revivals: the winter of disaster passed, and with the spring the Flowering City, Ἀνθοῦσα, as her inhabitants loved to call her, rose again with the vigour of a new life. And in raising the question of the historical significance of Constantinople we are really asking what is the significance of the East Roman Empire, for the Empire became concentrated in the capital. The course of events from the fourth to the seventh century quite definitely settled that: there was to be but one centre for the Empire, and that centre was New Rome. Just recall to your mind some of the spheres of the Empire's life, and you will, I think, agree that my statement is true. The struggle of the Bishop of Constantinople to assert his authority over the metropolitan of Heraclea, and then his embittered contest with the ecclesiastical Pharaoh, the patriarch of Alexandria, during the monophysite controversy resulted in the victory of the capital. Through chicanery and violence the orthodox faith conquered, and the triumph of orthodoxy was at the same time the triumph of the patriarch of New Rome. When after the early successes of the Arabs the monophysite lands were lost to Rome, the patriarchs of Alexandria, of Antioch, and of Jerusalem were all alike Bishops *in partibus infidelium*: the supremacy of the See of Constantinople was unchallenged.

In another sphere, that of art, during the fourth and fifth centuries, Antioch and Jerusalem were both independent centres from which artistic influences radiated through the Roman world; but from Justinian's reign onward Constantinople became the source, or at least the channel, whence the West drew its artistic inspiration, even though Strzgowski may be right in thinking

that Serbia derived the plans for her churches from direct contact with Jerusalem.

Constantinople was also the centre of the successive literary revivals in which the study of the classic masterpieces was renewed—when thought and style turned with fresh determination into the ancient paths.

Increasingly, too, the capital became the point to which flowed the trade and wealth of the whole Empire. Everywhere Roman currency passed freely: the bezants of Constantinople outlived the Empire itself; and with this change in the direction of commerce, routes naturally followed suit. Formerly it had been literally true that all roads led to Rome; but now the road system was altered, as Professor Ramsay has shown, so as to lead to the new capital: for example, the highways of Asia Minor from their meeting point at Nicomedia were connected with Constantinople.

And to the capital flowed the revenue derived from the taxation of the provinces: for taxation in the Empire of East Rome was not, as in the West, an extraordinary measure. The Emperors regularly exacted money payments, and the strength of the Central Government lay in the fact that it was not confined to the strictly covenanted services of Western feudalism: its power was based on an elastic money economy, and it could thus maintain a permanent and a professional army.

In administration, too, the successive changes in the bureaucratic system were all designed to strengthen central control: intermediate stages in the hierarchy of office were removed, and the agents of the State were brought into direct contact with the authorities in the capital. Constantinople was the heart of the Empire: there was stored the Empire's driving force. Thus before we try in a few sentences to sum up that for which Constantinople stood, you will endeavour for a brief while to think yourself away from here, and to live once more in Byzantine Constantinople, for that is the only way to be just to the people of East Rome. Even in our own despite those judgments of the text-books haunt us—they are so ready with their opprobrious adjectives—you know them so well: "those ignorant, cowardly, treacherous, violent, immoral Byzantines." We will resolutely banish these facile terms, and recall what we remember from their own records when we read them in a mood of sympathetic comprehension, and we will recall nothing that is not vouched for us by those records. Things are rather easier for us now: we can feel something of the temper of this great city, always on the defensive—her citizens never sure when some new

peril might not on a sudden burst in upon Roman lands and assail their walls—all through their history on guard against the barbarian and the misbeliever, Saracen, Patzinak, Russian, Goth, Avar, Bulgar, Hun—their villas outside the western walls burnt down, their churches in the suburbs sacked—with the Persian at Chalcedon just across the strait, as in 626, and the Slav at the same moment ravaging right up to their gates. Think of the strain of nerve that this guardianship of Europe means, and with strain of nerve violence and excess. At times one feels one can stand it no longer, one becomes exasperated, balance goes, cruelty is not far off then: at moments strain may culminate in an outburst of "frightfulness," for this is no northern crowd, but Greeks with the passion and the recklessness of a Greek, and barbarous folk, too, drawn from frontier districts—not Romanised yet—and a little madness soon leavens a crowd. And then you must have relaxation, and your relaxation also will have in it something of violence—your life is strung too taut to avoid that. And when you get into the Hippodrome—for Sancta Sophia, the church of the Divine Wisdom, and the Hippodrome are the two centres of Byzantine life (and curiously they are the two great memorials which exist to-day)—when you get into the Hippodrome you see all the Greens, the folk of the other circus party, crowding the benches opposite you; for you are a Blue, your father was a Blue before you, and how you hate those Greens with their taunts and cries! For you are not merely interested in a race of chariots, though your hero Theophanes, the peerless charioteer, is racing to-day, and *that's* enough to make your blood run faster—what a wonder he is—they put up a statue to him in the market-place the other day, you remember. No, you are part of an organised society, for, of course, the Blues and Greens, under their own officers, are also the police of the city—they are the corporate expression of city life—of the πόλις, and when a surprise attack comes they may be ordered to man the walls, if the Emperor can't get troops across from Asia Minor in time.

You are, you see, part of an organisation—not a mere single isolated spectator—and you are jealous for your organisation, and that adds to the tension. And then, as every one knows, the Emperor is a Green, and all the Blues think that he has not treated them fairly: what about that judgment against Priscus, the treasurer of the Blues, for embezzlement? Who can tell if he was really guilty? No, you are against the Government on political grounds, and the Greens are hand-in-glove with the Government just now; and, what is far the worst of all, many

of the Greens are heretics, and men do say that the Emperor himself is not orthodox: the Greens have seduced him, perhaps, and if the Emperor is not orthodox, what of God's anger for our sins? Why, there was a report from the Eastern front the other day that the Persians have captured the fortress of Amida: anything may happen under a heretic Emperor, and that's the work of the Greens: how you hate them! You see we common folk are keenly interested in theology; you remember what Gregory of Nyssa said years ago in one of his sermons, "The city is full of mechanics and slaves who are all of them profound theologians and preach in the shops and in the streets. If you desire a man to change a piece of money for you he informs you wherein the Son differs from the Father: if you ask the price of a loaf, you are told by way of reply that the Son is inferior to the Father, and if you inquire whether the bath is ready the answer is that the Son was made out of nothing." But after all it is very natural, for religion comes into everything: why, every merchant knows that if you put your bargain into writing and invoke the name of the Trinity at the end, you don't need to call all the witnesses to the contract that you would otherwise; and as for the sign of the Cross, the Devil would be constantly injuring you if it were not for that. You remember that passage in the life of the Bishop of Lampsacus that has just been published; the holy man was visiting the sick, when suddenly a huge, fierce dog attacked him: he made the sign of the cross at once—he had the presence of mind for that—and the dog fell back powerless: his biographer adds, "the dog came, doubtless, not from any house, but from the Great Dog." He meant the Devil, of course, and you know that he was right. And if it were not for the Holy Mother of God, Constantinople itself might have fallen: did not the Avar prisoners tell us that when the attack was fiercest they saw a stately lady of wondrous majesty guarding the city walls and that a great fear seized them and they fled—and it's the same at Thessalonica: the barbarians would have captured it if it had not been for St. Demetrius, who rode at the head of our troops?

And when one is ill, really seriously ill, one does not trust the doctor; one goes and lies all night in the church of St. John the Baptist by the shrine of St. Artemius, who was killed about 300 years ago. Men and women come from all over the Empire when their doctors cannot help them: a relative of ours, a general in the army of Egypt, came and was cured the other day, and an aunt of ours was cured by St. Febronia, who treats

the women, you know, under St. Artemius' direction: she died a martyr hundreds of years ago. No, doctors are often heretics: you remember the story that St. Ephraim, the Syrian, told: it happened in Constantinople in the fourth century. There was a plague, and there was a doctor in the city who looked after the very poor folk living in underground rooms: they suffered from the plague very badly. And he actually said that it was because of the foul air in these cellar rooms that people died: did you ever hear anything so blasphemous?—foul air! They died because God willed it. All the other doctors were indignant; but he just went on tending the poor folk, and then he caught the plague and died too: of course it was a judgment of outraged Heaven! All through life religion comes in: why, our niece was christened the other day, and she was so fortunate that she had a sacred icon of St. Luke for her godfather, but then our nephew is at the monastery of Studium: that was why it was: he is copying manuscripts of the classics, and is learning to paint miniatures on the borders of the parchment. He is reading Plato, but though the great St. Basil in his book to students said that it was a good thing to read the classics, and though they are copied in the monasteries, can a good Christian really study Plato? It is better to read the lives of the holy monks and, above all, of the hermits. A cousin of ours is writing a chronicle—he is a learned man in a monastery—from Adam down to to-day: a world-history, for Christ died for the world, and so you must take in all history: when will all the world become Christian? An Iberian chieftain came to Constantinople the other day, and when he saw the Court and our splendid soldiers, and the choirs, and the Emperor on his great throne, and the lions roaring at the foot—he thought they were real lions—it was all so glorious that he was speechless: he could only stammer, "Your Emperor is a God," and he has become a Christian, and the Emperor is going to be his godfather, when he is baptised, and then he will guard the passes of the Caucasus for us, and some day all the pagans will be converted. The Church is sending missionaries and a Bishop to Iberia now.

Well, we must be going back to our shop, where we sell spices, for the guild has just bought a large consignment from the Malabar merchants, and we must buy what we want from the guild. We can't buy it ourselves directly, of course, because the guild regulates prices and stocks and wages, and the city prefect sees that they do their work well: for the working men are secured a proper wage in Constantinople, and no busi-

ness must grow too big or it might monopolise trade and raise prices, and the Government will not allow that. Everything comes to our city from the whole world! And on the way we must look at that grand new church that two Armenian architects have designed in the shape of a cross, and they do say that they are going to put in it a splinter of the Holy Wood: a monk carried it off by night from a church in Cappadocia: the people of the village were furious and pursued him, but he got safe away: one must guard relics so carefully. And next week there is a fat woman coming to Constantinople. She has been travelling through the cities of Asia, and everyone has been to see her, and we wonder whether the clever dog that has been performing in Antioch will be brought here too; he has an uncanny skill in pointing out the spectators that have broken their marriage vows. And next month we are actually going to see Daniel, the wonderful pillar saint: he has never once come down from his pillar for thirty years: he cannot stand any longer: his poor, swollen feet will not perform their office, but still he prays, prays for all of us toiling folk, away in the cities, who are living our hard lives and begetting us children and sinning and suffering—prays for our armies, too, away there on the Eastern frontier—the armies of the Lord Christ fighting the misbeliever who worships the sun and the horse. Ah! yes, the saint, too, fights the Empire's battles: the prayer of a righteous man availeth much. Some time ago our neighbour Stephen, the coppersmith, went on a pilgrimage to the saint, and as the holy man leant against the side of his cage under the scorching sun a drop of sweat from the poor, wracked body fell on to the dust at Stephen's very feet: oh, joy! oh, wonder! Will the same blessed chance happen to us?—then we would roll up that precious drop in a ball of dust, and, wherever we are, that precious drop of sweat will three times cure disease. We believe, of course we believe, in the far Christ, throned in glory, Whom we have not seen, but when we get home we shall have our little picture of that human figure wrestling with God for us there in its loneliness, and before it we shall light our little lamp, and locked away in surest safety we shall have that little ball of dust with the drop of sweat caught therein, and it will cure us, and it is very near and very heartening—that gift of faith, that gift of prayer. . . .

This city of Constantinople, the Church, the State, what was its achievement, its historical significance? Well, it is, of course, a truth that we can never forget when we take our prayer-books in our hands that it was the Church of East Rome that formulated

the creed of Christian orthodoxy; for Greek thought had not lost its own subtlety and love of metaphysic. The West was practically minded, was concerned with the problem of the freedom of the human will and of human salvation, but the East could not rest until it had fathomed the nature of the Godhead itself, so far as that was given to man. Of that we are conscious every Sunday, but we do not so often think of the Church's work of Hellenisation. The successors of Alexander the Great had carried on his task of bringing to the East the language and the culture of Greece; but though in the south, under the Seleucid monarchs, Greek influences had penetrated far into Asia, in the north the central plateau of Asia Minor was but little affected by the West, and the biographies of the Saints show us that the native languages lived on even into the fifth and sixth centuries of our era. Here it was the Church which finally brought about the triumph of the Greek tongue, just as it has been the Church which has maintained it through the centuries of Turkish rule. But though it imposed Greek on the peoples of Asia Minor, the Church of East Rome was bound by no rigid linguistic dogma as was the West. There Rome had done her work so thoroughly that the Church needed only the Latin language; and usage hardened into precedent, so that Rome refused to allow that any other tongue could be legitimately employed in worship: thus the vernacular Slav service-books were suppressed. The Eastern Church was more liberal, and when it met with a national language it encouraged a national literature. The Armenian alphabet was invented on East Roman soil, and the literature of Armenia was formed by translations of East Roman works. The Syriac literature was founded under East Roman patronage, and though some of the greatest Syriac writers were monophysite heretics, it was the Eastern Church which had rendered that opposition possible. East Roman missionaries invented their early script for the Slavs, and East Roman theology formed the material for the beginnings of literature amongst Bulgars, Serbs, and Russians. The Eastern Church was free from the restrictions which bound the West: it called into being a national ecclesiastical literature in the vulgar tongue and a civil literature followed. The heroic poetry of Serbia is thus the gift of East Rome.

The East Roman Church identified itself with the life of its worshippers, and what it lost in adapting its standards to the practice of its members, it gained in intimacy and close familiar contact. It was ready to embrace all forms of popular devotion:

monasticism, at first in large measure a protest against a too facile Christianity, the pillar saint, an excessive form of devotion, adapted, it may be, from Syrian pagan practices—it mattered not, all were included under its tolerant patronage; and it has had its reward: it has maintained its hold on the people's life; and since the Church has changed so little—is still the Church of the Seven Councils—it can only be understood by studying its Byzantine past; that is why the ecclesiastical history of East Rome is also modern history.

And if we ask what were the services which the Church rendered to the State in return for State support, we may say that the Church developed a new theory of empire. The earthly kingdom is but a counterpart of the heavenly: the sovereign is no longer the puppet of the Prætorians, he is the Elect of God, God's Vicegerent, and everything which concerns him is sacred. Just as the heavenly kingdom is universal, so is the earthly: Rome may suffer defeat for her sins, but by right the world is hers, because she is Christ's, her Emperor is lord of the earthly universe, *κοσμικὸς αὐτοκράτωρ*. Just as the heavenly kingdom is eternal, so is the earthly. Roma Æterna had been a political faith under the pagan Empire; at Constantinople the eternity of Rome became a religious verity; and thus the Empire could not die: it arose like the Phœnix, and in each resurrection the power that burst the stone and broke the seal was its Christian faith. Thus, too, the Church was a missionary Church, and every new convert became the Empire's subject or ally. The bond of union in the Roman Empire could not be a common nationality: when Rome outstepped the confines of Italy that tie was no longer possible. In the early days the link was found in a common citizenship—a principle more flexible, more catholic, more capable of expansion than that of a common nationality. The pagan Empire endeavoured to attach this conception to religious associations—to the worship of Rome and the genius of the Emperor in the first century, to Aurelian's Imperial worship of the Unconquered Sun in the third. But where the pagan Empire failed, the Christian Empire triumphed: the bond of union became, not nationality—that was impossible in the ethnic museum of the Empire—not so much civic privilege, but a common orthodox religious faith. Just as to the Jew, so to the East Roman, religion was the cement of the social fabric; to be an orthodox subject of East Rome was to belong to the chosen people. For in the East Church and State entered into partnership. After the close of the Iconoclast controversy the Church did

not claim to subject the State to herself, as did Rome in the West, and it is this different conception of the relation between the ecclesiastical and the civil ruler which was perhaps the most potent factor in rendering any permanent union with the Papal Church an impracticable dream. Thus, in the Roman Empire, politics and religion joined hands, and the significance of the religious factor in the political life of the Near East of our own day is an inheritance from Byzantium.

And if we ask what is the significance of the East Roman State, it is, of course, a commonplace to say that it saved for us the heritage of the classic past. But, curiously enough, that is coming to mean more to us in our day: for it seems to me that, though we hardly realise it yet, the opening years of the twentieth century have seen a new renascence in classic study. The student of history may be excused if he has sometimes felt that the scholar and philologist have claimed for themselves what was meant for the world: a new humanism is asserting its right to the classics: we ordinary folk are becoming more conscious of our debt to Byzantium. But Constantinople was not only the librarian of Europe: it preserved Roman traditions of administration and of the art of government. For Rome wore her absolutism with a difference: the outstanding fact which impresses one the more, the more closely one studies the history of the Empire, is the realisation by the Emperors that it is the duties of a sovereign which are paramount. Marcus Aurelius, the philosopher, spending his life amidst the hazards and the hardships of frontier campaigns, stealing only his nights for himself and the things of the mind, is but a type of many. Sovereignty is described by East Roman writers as a "royal priesthood," and the priest lives for his flock and for his God. It is profoundly significant that Rome never entirely abandoned her theory of elective succession: a series of *rois fainéants* could not be tolerated in Rome. Read the *De Regno* of Synesius, read the poems of George of Pisidia, and you will see there the ideal of Roman kingship, summed up in George's line,

ὡς εὖ κρατοῦσα σὺν Θεῷ μοναρχία

—"How fair a rule is monarchy with God for guide!" And this conception of government carried with it other consequences: for successful government demands knowledge, and thus was maintained Rome's splendid curiosity as to the peoples with which the Empire was brought into contact. The true Imperialist must perforce go to school with history, and that is why the Roman

historical tradition never dies in Constantinople: to take but one example, what the Slav nations know of their origins is derived almost entirely from the Byzantine historians.

And Constantinople preserved also Rome's great tradition of law; though there are intervals of anarchy, the rule of law always reasserts itself, until it is at length handed over to the keeping of the barbarous West. Under the shelter of the rule of law Constantinople continued, like the earlier Rome, to be receptive: she was not ashamed to learn from others, and she then put her own stamp on what she had learned. Thus in architecture the cupola came from the East, but the pendentive which could raise the circular dome over the square of pillars below was, it seems, the invention of East Roman architects, and in Sancta Sophia the architecture of the East became a new thing and flowered into perfection.

And lastly, for my time is gone, Constantinople, "the City of the World's Desire," stood as the bulwark of Europe: against its walls the billows of barbarian invasion dashed and broke in unavailing fury. Only when the Empire seemed like to fall did men form a single word to sum up all that it meant for them—in the dark hour at the beginning of the seventh century we find the word *Romania* on their lips standing for ordered life and law and civilisation ranged against unthinkable chaos. On a tile, dating probably from just about this time, found in the Danube lands, is scratched the prayer, "God Save Romania"; and for us, with our world in the welter of war, that prayer gives us the answer to our question as to the historical significance of Constantinople: for that prayer is ours: "God Save Romania"!

NORMAN H. BAYNES.

NEW LIGHT ON SAINT FRANCIS AND HIS ORDER.

FATHER CUTHBERT, O.S.F.C. *Life of St. Francis of Assisi.* Longmans, 1912. 6s. net.

JOHANNES JÖRGENSEN. *Saint Francis of Assisi: A Biography.* Longmans, 1912. 12s. 6d.

E. GILLIAT-SMITH. *Saint Clare of Assisi: Her Life and Legislation.* J. M. Dent, 1914. 10s. 6d.

[ANON.] *St. Clare and Her Order. A Story of Seven Centuries.* Mills and Boon, 1915. 7s. 6d.

FATHER CUTHBERT, O.S.F.C. *The Romanticism of St. Francis.* Longmans, 1915. 6s. 6d

THE last three or four years have seen the publication in this country of several noteworthy books in the domain of Franciscan Studies. That branch of historical study is not one of great age. It is true that ever since the foundation of the Order in the early thirteenth century, commentators, biographers, and chroniclers have been at work on matters concerning the Order. But it is not much more than thirty years since the study of Franciscan sources, the investigation of documents, and generally the reconstruction of the surroundings of the early Franciscan life began. The debt which those concerned with Franciscan Studies owe to Monsieur Paul Sabatier for his pioneer work in this field and to his infectious enthusiasm for all that relates to the Saint can scarcely be over-estimated. Until quite recently, indeed, Sabatier's *Life of St. Francis* in the English translation was the staple source of the knowledge of things Franciscan which English readers possessed. And up to a certain point it is a thoroughly good source. It is based on unquestionable scholarship and a critical understanding of the original documents. It must be confessed, however, that Sabatier's work does not altogether satisfy those who are unable to regard St. Francis and his life from the standpoint of the Liberal-Protestant theologian. A Free Church minister recently remarked to the present writer

that he thought St. Francis could be described as the typical "Free Churchman" of the Middle Ages. A more fundamental misunderstanding of the Saint's character and work could scarcely be imagined. Nor has the mass of German criticism on St. Francis given us a different appreciation. Such works as Walther Goetz's *Die Quellen zur Geschichte des hl. Franz von Assisi* (1905), or Gustav Schnürer's *Franz von Assisi* (1905), or E. Wauer's *Entstehung und Ausbreitung des Klarissenordens* (1906), while of undoubted critical value, have left much to be desired in the eyes of those who really appreciate St. Francis' position in the thirteenth century, and, indeed, in the life of the Church. Much excellent work, critical in its scholarship, but at the same written from a distinctively Catholic standpoint, has been produced in the present century in France by writers such as Père E. d'Alencon and Père Mandonnet, and in Italy by the learned Fathers of the Collegium Sancti Bonaventuræ of Florence, whose great service to historical studies has consisted in providing a long series of carefully edited Franciscan Texts. But in this country there has been very little contribution to Franciscan studies until quite recent years; though in this connection reference must be made to Mr. A. G. Little's work upon several important aspects of Franciscanism, notably upon the Grey Friars of Oxford.

Consequently the five books which have appeared recently, and which are enumerated at the head of this article, are particularly welcome. They are all written by Roman Catholic authors, and show the Franciscan Order and the Order of St. Clare from a point of view more consonant with the spirit which actuated the founders of those Orders. The first four volumes of the five have been published for some time and have already been extensively reviewed. Consequently it appears best to pass over them somewhat rapidly, and to give most attention to the most recent volume, *The Romanticism of St. Francis.*

Father Cuthbert, as head of the Capuchin branch of the Order of St. Francis in England, is in a peculiarly advantageous position for giving to British readers an insight into Franciscanism. He has had by virtue of his position an opportunity of knowing the Order as few know it. His *Life of St. Francis of Assisi* is probably the best life of the Saint which has yet been published. While written in an interesting and attractive style, which will commend it to the average reader who is not a specialist in Franciscan studies, the book is at the same time thoroughly scholarly and critical. A somewhat elaborate system of footnotes enables

the student to ascertain the authority upon which the author bases his account of each separate incident in the life. While the whole Life is well done, reference may be made in particular to Book iv., which gives a most striking account of the last two years of St. Francis' life, of the Christmas Festival at Greccio, of the Stigmatisation on Mount Alverna, of the last journey to Assisi and the Porziuncola and of the triumphant death. But valuable as is the narrative contained in the volume, the portion of the book which is of the greatest critical importance and which does most to advance our knowledge of the whole subject, consists of the appendices. The first gives an analysis of the First Rule of the Order, viz., that of 1221; the second weighs the evidence for and against the authenticity of the Indulgence of the Porziuncola—and sums up generally in favour of its authenticity: the third deals with the original version of the Rule of the Third Order; and in the fourth, the most valuable of all, on the sources of our knowledge of St. Francis, Father Cuthbert reviews all the documents which form part of the study of the subject and appraises their relative value.

J. Jörgensen's *Saint Francis of Assisi* appeared in this country in 1912 as a translation by Dr. T. O'Conor Sloane from the Danish original. In its treatment of the subject the book is, on the whole, similar to that of Father Cuthbert. It also follows closely the original documents—the only really satisfactory basis for a biography of the Saint. But Jörgensen is at times inclined to desert his authorities and draw upon his imagination. For example, it would be difficult to show the actual historical basis for a good deal of his first chapter describing the illness which preceded St. Francis' conversion. In one matter, however, Jörgensen seems to take a sounder line than Father Cuthbert. He frankly accepts the position that the development of the Franciscan Order as a learned body was opposed to the intentions and principles of St. Francis himself; whereas Father Cuthbert in his Life, and still more, as will be seen, in his *Romanticism of St. Francis*, endeavours to explain the difficulty away. Jörgensen adds to his work a valuable Appendix on Authorities for the Life of St. Francis, which covers the same ground as the Fourth Appendix to Father Cuthbert's Life, but treats the material somewhat differently.

Mr. Ernest Gilliat-Smith has provided in his volume, *Saint Clare of Assisi: Her Life and Legislation*, the most complete and detailed account of St. Clare which has been

published in this country. The first half of the book deals with the Life of the Saint. Among other useful features it contains in Chapter I. a careful review of the evidence concerning St. Clare's kinsfolk, a review which is somewhat damaging to the views generally held on that question; and a comparison of the account of her conversion and subsequent life in the cloister, as given by Thomas of Celano, with that of Pope Alexander IV. In Chapter X. Mr. Gilliat-Smith treats in some detail the story of the Repast of St. Francis and St. Clare at the Porziuncola, and classes it among stories "which have been deliberately invented" and which are "offensive to pious ears"; and while it must be admitted that the historical foundation for that exceedingly beautiful incident is not as good as might be wished, still his condemnation of the whole incident seems scarcely warranted. The second part of the book is concerned with St. Clare's Legislation and with the four rules observed by her followers during her own lifetime. The Appendix contains the Latin text of the Rule of Saint Clare of 1253, in which the author endeavours to determine which portions are the work of Saint Clare herself.

The volume, *Saint Clare and her Order*, which is described as edited by the author of *The Enclosed Nun*, is not a book which makes much original contribution to knowledge: it scarcely claims to do so. It gives a good account of the life of St. Clare and an English version of the First Rule of St. Clare and of the Rule as reformed by St. Colette. There is a useful chapter on the Clares of Great Britain, which is a convenient summary of hitherto ascertained facts as to the Pre-Reformation Houses of Clares in this country; and which also describes the return of the Clares to England and their more recent foundations in England, Scotland, and Ireland. The book contains a summary account of those members of the Order of St. Clare who have received canonisation or beatification. Speaking generally, the book is a useful compendium of somewhat miscellaneous information about the Order from its foundation down to the present century.

It remains now to deal in somewhat greater detail with Father Cuthbert's latest book, *The Romanticism of Saint Francis*. "The present volume," he says, in his preface, "consists of four distinct 'studies,' in each of which an attempt has been made to present the inner thought of some aspect of the Franciscan life." His first study is on "The Romanticism of St. Francis." In it the author shows how St. Francis "consecrated the romantic

temperament and vision" ; how he adopted in his own life and implanted in the Catholic consciousness of his own age and of succeeding ages an entirely fresh outlook on religion and life, a devotion to poverty as a "sacrament bringing its receivers into communion with spiritual realities which are a vital joy to those who perceive them" ; an intense love of Nature, which is an essential characteristic of the Romanticist in every age. He shows how St. Francis took all that was purest and best in the mediæval chivalry and spiritualised it so as to become a fitting part of the life of the Church. Obedience to the ideal of "the poor Christ," as the foundation of Franciscan discipline; truthfulness in every department of conduct and of thought; "holy, pure simplicity" ; and pity, which starts from the source of care for the lepers—all these Father Cuthbert develops as the characteristics of the Franciscan spirit. Then St. Francis is shown as the intensely loyal son of the Catholic Church, *homo totus Catholicus et totus Apostolicus*. The last chapter in this study is devoted to an examination of St. Francis' attitude towards learning. While admitting fully that St. Francis' chief hostility may have been to scholastic learning, and not to all kinds of intellectual activity, one cannot feel that Father Cuthbert's explanation and defence of the later development of the Franciscan Order as a body characterised by its learning, as being in no way opposed to the principles of its Founder, are as successful or convincing as the rest of his study; but whether one is convinced or not, his examination of the whole subject is most suggestive and stimulating.

The second study deals with St. Clare of Assisi. It is a fitting pendant to his study of St. Francis himself. For who can estimate the influence exerted upon St. Francis by the character of St. Clare, an influence which was with him from the very beginning of the Order until his death, and which after his death kept alive the ideals and aims of the Saint in their purest and truest form for a quarter of a century? Far too little study has until now been devoted to the person and character of St. Clare; and that makes Mr. Gilliat-Smith's volume on the subject all the more acceptable.

The third study, on "The Story of the Friars," traces in some detail the history of the Friars in the centuries which followed the death of St. Francis. The difficult questions of poverty and learning are carefully considered: and an attempt is made to estimate the influence of leaders such as St. Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, and William of Occam in framing Franciscan thought.

Then Father Cuthbert traces the influence of the Friars Minor in humanizing society as a whole, in acting as peace-makers, in raising the standard of family life, and in creating a popular religious literature.

The fourth and last study is entitled "A Modern Friar." It gives an illuminating account of the life, thought, and work of Father Alphonsus, a Capuchin Friar, who died as recently as 1911, and shows how it is possible for the fundamental principles of Franciscanism to remain alive and active up to the present day, and to find their place in relation to the conditions of modern life in a slum district, utterly different as those conditions are from the conditions of thirteenth century Umbria. But it must be confessed that this fourth study is the least convincing of those contained in this volume. Admirable as Father Alphonsus must have been, it may be doubted whether he can be regarded as a typical product of the Franciscan Order, either of the Order as it exists nowadays or even of the Order as it was at the time of its foundation.

In conclusion, this must be said about Father Cuthbert's latest book. It will be found of the greatest interest and value to those who come to it with a fairly detailed knowledge both of the lives of St. Francis and of St. Clare and of the original documents of Franciscanism in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; but to those who have not that knowledge the book will be difficult and perhaps rather intangible. For serious students of Franciscan studies it is of the highest value.

WALTER W. SETON.

THE COLONISATION OF ULSTER.[1]—I.

Up to the beginning of the sixteenth century Ireland was never really subdued. Owing to the incomplete nature of the English conquest, and to the weakness of the Irish executive, the effects of the Norman Invasion had been almost neutralised, and at the end of the Middle Ages five-eighths of Ireland had been regained by the clans, and English power confined to the narrow limits of the Pale.

By the adoption of Protestantism, which implied the rise of a strong national State, England took up a new and important position on the Continent, which she was obliged to vindicate by force of arms. To strengthen her European position she had to secure political and religious unity at home. This necessitated a complete change of policy in Ireland, where the weakness of her power now constituted a real danger. Geographical proximity made the country a possible base for a foreign offensive, and it had already proved an admirable platform for Yorkist intrigue. The absolute command of Ireland was essential in a military sense to the imperial safety of England; and so a determined effort was made to secure Irish loyalty and to solve the Irish problem. Instead of a half-hearted policy of defence of the English colony in Ireland, the Government first tried to rule through the Kildares, an unfortunate experiment which ended in rebellion and war. Then Henry VIII., who had some traits of statesmanship, determined upon a policy of conciliation, which at the same time involved an attempt to break down the tribal system of the clans.[2] A number of plausible conditions were held out to the Irish chieftains, who, impressed as they were by the fall of the Geraldines, and by a series of vigorous campaigns, soon fell into line with the royal policy. They agreed to acknowledge the King's authority and to surrender their lands to the Crown, receiving them back again by letters patent, to hold in accordance with English law. This policy of "surrender

[1] For further reading see the writer's *Brief Bibliography of Irish History*, 1911 (Hist. Assoc. Leaflets, No. 23).

[2] R. Dunlop, *Henry VIII.'s Irish Policy* (Owens Coll. Hist. Essays, 1907).

and regrant," which was frequently renewed, struck a blow at the root of the tribal system, and though seemingly plausible was both unjust and unwise.[3] By Irish law the land belonged to the tribe, and the chiefs who were elected, and who did not necessarily succeed each other from father to son, had only a life interest in the demesne lands attached to their office. The English Government thus ignored the septs, who were the real owners of the land, and treated the chiefs' lands as if they were those of feudal barons, *i.e.*, as if they were their own private property, and could pass on to their heirs. The chiefs, no doubt, were quite willing to convert their unstable life interests into firm feudal tenures, but they were unable to alter the whole system of the clan, a fact which was forced upon the attention of the Government, so that the policy of conciliation finally led to war. The aim of voluntarily securing Irish loyalty was abandoned, the subjection of the country was achieved through conquest, and by the policy of plantation it was hoped that permanent results would be secured. The Tudor Plantations were that of Leix and Offaly, which resulted from a revolt of the O'Connors and the O'Mores; that of Munster, which followed the important rising of the Earl of Desmond; that in Ulster, which was the sequel to a long and troubled period in the North, due to the strength of the clans and to the dangerous ambitions of the O'Neills.

Ulster has always occupied a distinct place in the history of Ireland. The inhabitants of the ancient kingdom were distinguished by their warlike character, and by their distinctive traditions and legends. Only a few of their kings played a prominent part in the general affairs of the country, but by the time of the Norman Conquest the chiefs of the O'Neills, and of the kindred clan of the O'Donnells, had consolidated their power in their respective territories of Tyrone and Tyrconnell, and had asserted their supremacy over the other tribal groups. Henry II. made a sweeping grant of the whole of Ulster to John de Courcy, but though the present counties of Down and Antrim were soon thickly colonised by Normans, no really permanent conquests were made west of the Bann.[4] The third Earl of Ulster, the "Great De Burgo," did indeed assert an effective sovereignty over the North, but his power was shattered by the Bruce invasion, which marked the turning-point of English

[3] W. F. Butler, *The Policy of Surrender and Regrant. Journ. R.S. Antiquaries, Ireland*, Vol. XLIII.

[4] G. H. Orpen, *The Earldom of Ulster. Journ. R.S.A. Ireland*, Vols. XLIII.-IV.

power in Ireland in the Middle Ages. The great Earl was twice defeated by Bruce, the country was laid desolate, the colonists were weakened and disheartened, many of the English barons joined the Irish, while the loyal settlers clung to isolated fortresses, or were driven to the coast. Nearly all Ulster and Connaught were lost to the English, and the O'Neills ruled as practical suzerains of the North for nearly three hundred years. They crossed the Bann and seized most of Down and Antrim, they took tribute for the town of Dundalk, and at one time the great castle of Carrickfergus fell into their hands.[5] The English made several attempts to regain their footing in the North, but by the beginning of the sixteenth century they had met with no success, and Ulster is designated in the State Papers not only as "the most rude and unreformed part of Ireland," but as "the most perilous part of all the Isle."[6]

The resistive strength of Ulster can be traced to three sources:—geographical peculiarity; proximity to Scotland, then hostile to England; and the power of the clans, organised more or less as they were under the able leadership of the O'Neills. Ulster is surrounded on three sides by the sea, and on the south a complete line of natural defence was provided, in the west by the waters of Lough Erne, in the east by the Fews Mountains rising in front of Dundalk, and in the centre by the lakes and hills of Monaghan and Cavan. In the interior the country is mountainous, and was at that time covered with thick forests which formed admirable cover for the Irish, but were practically impenetrable to English soldiery.[7] For centuries there had been a close connection between the north-east of Ireland and the south-west of Scotland, and there was a community not only of race, but of speech and social ideas. At the end of the fifteenth century, when the Scottish King had succeeded in breaking up the rival authority of the Lords of the Isles, a large number of Scots, led by the Macdonnells, made their way to Antrim and annexed the districts known as the Glynnes and the Route. Now that they were further removed, the Macdonnells were recognised by the Scottish Crown, and in 1545 James, the head of the clan, was elected "Lord of the Isles." He gained Argyllshire through marriage, and for services rendered against the English he received the whole of Northern Cantire.[8] The Scots were generally

[5] *Ulster Journ. Archæol.*, 1854, p. 141.

[6] Act of Attainder of Shane O'Neill (Irish Statutes, I., 322.)

[7] "The Irish will never be tamed while the leaves are on the trees" was a proverb of the wars of Elizabeth.

[8] Hill, *Macdonnells of Antrim. Ulster Journ. of Archæol.*, 1861-2.

favourable to the Irish, and served them as mercenaries, besides summoning their kinsmen from across the sea, by lighting bonfires upon the cliffs, when occasion required. They were definitely anti-English in sentiment, and their presence in Ulster was a continual thorn in the side of the English Government, so that in every plan formed at this time for the management of Ireland the expulsion of the Scots was recommended as indispensable.

The two most important of the tribes were those of the O'Neills and the O'Donnells. The O'Neills are described as "the chiefest of the Irishry," and they held the vast region of Tirowen, which included the modern county of Tyrone, as well as considerable parts of Londonderry and Armagh. A younger branch of the family held the district known as Clannaboy on the confines of Antrim and Down. Though the main body of this clan lived a pastoral life, wandering up and down the country with their cattle, O'Neill was able to raise a force of 300 gallowglass, many of whom were Scots, and over 1,000 kerne. The O'Donnells were the tribe of next importance, and they frequently contested the hegemony of the province with the O'Neills. They ruled over Tyrconnell, the present County of Donegal. O'Cahan of Coleraine was O'Neill's chief vassal. The other chiefs, who were for the most part connected with him by marriage, were O'Hanlon of Armagh, Maguire of Fermanagh, O'Reilly of Cavan, MacMahon of Monaghan, and O'Dogherty, who occupied the peninsula of Inishowen. A certain number of old Norman families still maintained themselves in the North, such as the Savages, Mandevilles, and Bissetts, but these had either merged themselves in the clans or were of such "poor estate" as to be of negligible political importance.[9] The power of the Northern chiefs, and especially the O'Neills, was really the main obstacle to English progress in the North—"her Majesty's outlay" unto the Lord Deputy "is wasted, so long as so many rebels still remain," and, again—"Ulster will never be reduced to good government until the principal heads are cut off."[10]

At first a policy of conciliation was tried in Ulster as elsewhere. Conn O'Neill agreed in 1543 to acknowledge Henry VIII.'s supremacy and to hold his lands from the Crown, in return for which he was created Earl of Tyrone. Owing to the confusion caused by the clash of feudal and tribal ideas as to the succession, war broke out between the Government and

[9] *Cf.* Bagenall's *Description of Ulster*, 1586. Cal. Carew MSS., II., p. 435.

[10] *A Discourse of Ireland*, 1601, *Cal. S.P. Irel.*, 1601–3, p. 250; Chichester to Salisbury, June 2, 1608, *Cal. S.P.I.*, 1606–8, p. 547.

Shane O'Neill, the successor nominated by the clan. The more formidable rebellion of Hugh at the end of the sixteenth century was caused by the same stupid policy of the Government, and a league of northern chieftains, supported by Spanish aid, almost led to the destruction of the English power in Ireland. A series of vigorous campaigns, however, turned the scale. O'Neill was rounded off by the building of forts in his rear. English sea-power ensured the bringing up of reserves, and Scottish loyalty to England was secured, and finally sealed by the union of the English and Scottish Crowns. After the most horrible war of attrition O'Neill was forced to surrender, and the reduction of Ulster, the strongest, richest, and most Irish of the Provinces, meant the reduction of the whole country. The chiefs of the leading clans were allowed to retain their lands, but the back of their power was broken; the introduction of English law and customs meant that they could no longer hope to retain any satisfactory influence over their people; so that, rather than submit to an impossible situation, O'Neill and O'Donnell left the country in September, 1607, hoping perhaps to return later to regain their rights with the aid of some foreign Power.[11]

The "Flight of the Earls" proved the failure of Tudor statesmanship, but the country was completely subdued, and the way was cleared for a fresh experiment in the solution of the Irish difficulty. Two main methods suggested themselves. Ireland, which was obviously in a primitive condition, was to be made more civilised, or, in other words, Anglicised; and, secondly, as Ireland had failed so miserably as a feudal dependency, she was to be planted by English settlers, *i.e.*, converted into a colony. The accession of James I. marked the beginning of a new era. He published an "Act of Oblivion"[12] whereby all offences committed in the previous reign were pardoned, and all the Irish were received into his Majesty's immediate protection. English administration was to be extended all over the country, sheriffs were admitted for the first time to Tyrone and Tyrconnell, and justices of assize went on circuit "like good planets in their several spheres."[13] All was prepared, declares a complacent English historian, "for the final establishment of the English power, upon the basis of equal laws and civilised customs."[14] At the same time the Irish law was formally abolished, and the

[11] F. Wilson, *The Flight of the Earls, Nineteenth Century*, Vol. 55, p. 479.
[12] Davies, *Discoverie*, 1612, p. 263.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 267.
[14] Hallam, *Constitutional History of England*. Vol. III., p. 375.

lesser tribesmen, without compensation, lost their proprietary rights.

Up to this time a very strong Gaelic civilisation had existed in Ireland, very similar to that which prevailed in the Highlands and in the West of Scotland up to the eighteenth century. It was partly tribal and partly mediæval in character, and totally unlike that of any other Western nation of the period. At present we know very little, comparatively speaking, of the social organisation of sixteenth-century Ireland; but when the Irish sources have been fully explored much light should be thrown on institutions which were in early times common to all Indo-European tribes, and an interesting chapter added to the history of survivals. The long-continued existence of the tribal system in Ireland really supplies the key to Irish history. Escaping from the harrow of the Roman law, it had shown a marked capacity for absorbing the invaders, and had always been the chief obstacle to the consolidation of the English power. The two most characteristic features of Irish land tenure were the customs of "Tanistry" and "Gavelkind."[15] The workable basis of the tribe was that the land belonged, not to any single individual, but to the clan as a whole. Thus the chief had only a life interest attached to his office, and though his apparent successor, the "Tanist," was, as a matter of fact, generally a blood relation, still, the clan reserved to itself the right of election. As for the semi-communistic tenure referred to as "Gavelkind," analogous systems were found in "the custom of Kent" and in the "Gavelkind" of North Wales, which was abolished by Henry VIII. Certain portions of land appear to have been marked off for each "fine" or family group, and a redistribution took place within limits, at certain intervals. The division of the tribe lands seems to have been as follows:—(1) The chief's demesne lands which lay round his stronghold, and which were generally occupied by cultivating tenants who supplied him with provisions. (2) There were the lands occupied by the free tribesmen for a certain rent, or merely for suit of court, such as the "termon" or church land, and the privileged lands of chroniclers, rhymers, and gallowglasses; and (3) there were the lands upon which charges were made, for the maintenance of troops, for the entertainment of the chief and his followers, for the building of forts, and so on.[16] Besides those actually settled on the land—in Ulster, at any rate—there

[15] *Cf. Brehon Law Tracts* (Rolls Series); Seebohm, *Tribal Systems in Wales*; Maine, *Early History of Institutions*.

[16] *Cf.* Mrs. Green, *Irish Land in the Sixteenth Century*, Eriu, 1907.

were the "swordsmen" who formed the retinue of the chiefs, and seemed to live largely on their neighbours, and the inferior class of nomad herdsmen, named "Creaghts," who occupied superfluous districts.[17] The whole system of land-owning was maintained by long-standing custom, which was embodied in the Brehon Law; the clansmen could not be deprived of their lands, and the relations between landlord and tenant were clearly defined. The food rents of Maguire's mensal lands, *e.g.*, were all contained in a parchment roll in the possession of the chief Brehon of his country—and when it was transmitted unto Davies, the English Attorney-General, "we perceived how many vessels of butter, how many measures of meal, how many porks, and other such gross duties did arise unto Maguire, out of his mensal lands." And, again, "we called unto us the inhabitants of every barony severally, and had present several of the clerks, or scholars of the country, who knew all the septs and families and all their branches . . . they look upon them to tell what quantity of land every man ought to have by the custom of their country."[18] The Irish, on the whole, may be said to have been still in the pastoral stage; though we get conflicting evidence even among English authorities as to the state of their agriculture. The constant warfare amongst the clans of itself made settled habits almost impossible. In 1551 the Lord Chancellor wrote: "The County of Tyrone is brought, through war of the Earl and his sons, to such extreme misery as there is not ten ploughs in all Tyrone."[19] Some of the devastation was due, no doubt, to the campaigns of the English, especially on the borders of the Pale, where, in face of the English armies which passed out of the Pale specially armed with scythes to level the growing corn, the Irish of the Border lands had learnt to keep their countries "of purpose, waste and uninhabited, as where nothing is, nothing can be had."[20]

The habit of "creaghting," however, was tribal in origin, and seems to have been widespread, especially in Ulster. The creaghts followed their large herds from pasture to pasture, dwelling wherever they went in booths, temporarily erected of boughs and turf. The people regarded their cattle as their most precious

[17] *Cf.* "The Creaghts of Fermanagh," *Ulst. Journ. Arch.*, 1896–7, and note in Hill, *Plantation of Ulster*, p. 99.

[18] Davies, *Historical Tracts*, Dublin edition, 1787, pp. 254–258. Also *cf.* Sir Toby Caulfeild's account of Tyrone's rents, *Cal. S.P.I.*, 1608–10, p. 532.

[19] *Cal. S.P.I.*, 1509–73, p. 117.

[20] Moran, *History of the Catholic Archbishops of Dublin*, I., p. 129. P. Wilson, *The Making of Modern Ireland*, p. 411.

possession, and Fynes Morrison describes how in Tyrone's War they drove their vast herds before them wherever they themselves were driven, and fought for them as for religion or life.[21] Most of the English writers eulogised the goodness and fertility of the soil, but condemned the slothfulness of the Irish and their primitive husbandry, especially the practice of "ploughing by the tail."[22]

The social life of the Irish was comparatively rude. They built no towns or villages and lived in houses of wattles or clay; even the castles of the chiefs were of timber, with thatched roofs. Their principal meat was pork, they also had plentiful supplies of oatmeal, milk, butter, herbs, chickens and rabbits. Their clothes differed according to their class, the poorer people having often little more than their celebrated Irish cloaks, while some of the chiefs were very gorgeously apparelled, as *e.g.*, O'Donnell, who in 1552 "had a coat of crimson velvet with aiglettes of gold, and over that a great double cloak of crimson satin, edged with black velvet, and a bonnet with a feather set full of aiglettes of gold."[23] Captain Cuellar, the Spaniard wrecked after the Armada upon the coasts of Donegal, wandered for some months in the interior before escaping to Spain, and gives the following account of the Irish: "The custom of these savages is to live as brute beasts among the mountains . . . they live in huts of straw; the men are all large-bodied and of handsome features and limbs, and as active as the roedeer. They do not eat oftener than once a day; and that which they usually eat is butter with oaten bread. . . . They clothe themselves with tight trousers and short, loose coats of very coarse goat's-hair. . . . They cover themselves with blankets, and wear their hair down to their eyes. . . . The chief inclination of their people is to be robbers and plunder each other, so that no day passes without a call to arms among them."[24]

The Irish chiefs, like those of the Highlands, had their regular courts, which were attended by their mercenaries, and by their hereditary officials, their bards and their brehons. The warrior class consisted of horsemen, arrayed, according to Spenser, like Chaucer's knight in coats of mail, of gallowglasses (mostly hired Scots), also mailed, and kerne, or lightly armed foot soldiers. The Irish fighting men were not to be despised, judging by the large sums mentioned in the State Papers as paid to them for

[21] Fynes Morrison, *Itinerary*, 1617, Part III., p. 160.
[22] Wm. Lithgow, *Adventures in Ireland*, 1619. (Reprinted in *Ulster Journ. Arch.*, 1911.)
[23] *State Papers, Hen. VIII.*, III., p. 320.
[24] Allingham, *Captain Cuellar's Adventures in Connacht and Ulster.*

immunity from molestation. Their coats of mail, their wolf-skins, their broad battle-axes, and their unkempt appearance made these Irish soldiery a source of wonder when they crossed the Channel. The retinue of Shane O'Neill produced a deep impression at the Court of Elizabeth,[25] and when Henry VIII. led Irish kerne to the siege of Boulogne, the French sent out heralds to inquire "whether they were men or devils who had been brought to fight against them?"[26]

The scholar class was highly venerated among the clans, each of whom had its own historian, bard, or brehon. The brehons kept the records of the clans and the tribal law, while the bards composed or recited poems at the Courts of the chiefs. The bardic poems, of which only a few have yet been published, should prove a very valuable source of information for the social life of the clans, for which at present we have only the prejudiced accounts of English writers, or the dull and scanty pages of the Irish Annals. In one of the poems., *e.g.*, written to celebrate the hospitality of Maguire at his stronghold at Enniskillen, the bard describes the exercising of wolf-dogs and horses outside the chief's residence by the Blue Hills. Abreast of the mansion the masts of a flotilla stood up along the shore. In the courtyard gentlemen dispensed largesse; the hall was crowded with minstrels and poets. In another apartment ladies embroidered rare tissues and wove golden webs. Elsewhere, fighting men predominated, and over each man's head his arms hung handy on the wall. There was a whole regiment of wrights, artificers who finished beakers, smiths who forged weapons; mantles and rugs were taking crimson stain, swords were being tempered to a right blue. Gallant men hurt were attended by the leach, brave men uninjured were being damaged (probably prisoners or malefactors). All manner of valuables were given away and were poured in. Some of the day was passed in listening to romances and in comparing genealogies, another part in fluid refection with the accompaniment of music. At dawn the hunting party went forth, and many a woman's wail for her husband that was not went up beside Lough Erne. Many a prisoner with his face slashed was led in. There were there in the fort things of price that in the morning were not there, and hard by grazed cattle that yesterday night were far away.[27] The Government did everything it could to discourage the bards, for it was

[25] Froude, *History of England*, VIII., p. 32.
[26] Bagwell, *Ireland under the Tudors*, I., p. 277.
[27] *British Museum Cat. Irish MSS.*, p. 430 *sqq.*

considered that they incited the people to savagery and stirred them up to rebellion.[28] They were indeed typical of the Irish civilisation and they scorned the English ways. They preferred "fair accomplishments," as they called them, to setting of fences round the arable,[29] and their good Irishmen would hate to carry at his ankle a jewelled spur or a boot, in the English fashion, or wear a gold-embroidered mantle, or a gold ring that would only be irksome. He would rather lie on rushes than on a feather-bed; a troop of horse at the brink of a gap, a fierce fight, a struggle with foot-soldiers—these were some of his desires.[30] After the Plantation, when the bards were scattered broadcast with loss of caste among the people, they popularised the old poems, and in this way helped to foster the literary sense for which the Irish peasantry is now famous. Many translations of mediæval works had been made in Ireland, but practically none of the refreshing influences of the Renaissance touched Irish literature or feeling—and the country remained outside the boundaries of European movements till influenced by the activities of the Counter Reformation. Then large numbers of Irishmen went abroad, the famous Irish colleges were founded at Paris, Louvain, Salamanca and elsewhere, and what education there was in Ireland was supplied in the noted schools of the Jesuits.

The Englishman of the period had no real hostility to Ireland and the Irish, but he looked upon the latter as a primitive people, ignorant, savage, and rude.[31] Shakespeare makes Captain MacMorris, the Irish soldier in Henry V., declare: "What ish my nation? Ish a villain, a bastard, a knave and a rascal."[32] The English judges condemned Tanistry and Gavelkind as "unreasonable and void," and Davies, the Attorney-General, spoke of the whole body of Brehon Law as a "lewd custom."[33] In the clash of cultures no attempt was made to see the Irish point of view, nor to meet the Irishman half-way; he, like the Red Indian, was to be educated to "English civilitie," so that, says Davies, "we may conceive a hope, that the next generation will in tongue and heart, and everyway else become English, so as there will be no difference or distinction but the Irish Sea betwixt us."[34] Accord-

[28] *Cf.* Derricke, *Image of Ireland*, 1581, p. 56; Spenser, *View of the State of Ireland*, 1633, p. 51.

[29] *Cat. Irish MSS.*, pp. 392–3.

[30] Poem quoted in *Journal* of the Ivernian Society, 1912–13, pp. 212–3.

[31] *Cf.* Morley, *Ireland under Elizabeth and James* (Spenser, Davies, and Fynes Morrison).

[32] *Henry V.*, Act III., sc. ii. *Cf.* Ben Jonson's *Irish Masque*.

[33] Davies, *Historical Tracts*, p. 278.

[34] Davies, *Discoverie*, p. 272.

ing to the new theory of governmental sovereignty which made no distinction between the State and the nation, English civilisation was to be imposed upon Ireland, first through legislation and then through the policy of confiscation. It would have been far better to have "drawn the Irish to civilisation," to use Spenser's phrase, but such a policy was beyond the intelligence of a period when implicit trust was placed in the power of the Government to effect not only political and religious, but also social changes.

(To be continued.)

FIFTY YEARS OF BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY.

During the last fifty years Great Britain has passed from a foreign policy of non-intervention to the position of protagonist in the greatest war ever waged. When Palmerston was dismissed in 1851, the Queen requested his successor, Lord Granville, to state the principles which he thought should control the foreign policy of this country. In Granville's memorandum we can discover the aims of Liberal statesmen when freed from the personality of Lord Palmerston, a position of affairs not, however, attained until his death in 1865. It dwells on the duty of Great Britain to encourage progress. She should show justice, moderation, and self-respect in enforcing her views, but as a trading nation she must protect the just pursuits of her subjects and obtain a security necessary to commercial success. Non-intervention was to be the watchword as far as the internal affairs of other nations were concerned, but that did not mean that there should be no more diplomacy. On the contrary, the memorandum shows the need for a highly-trained Foreign Office in the interests of international peace and well-being; for cases might occur in which the honour and good faith of Great Britain would require it to support its allies with "more than friendly assurances," though, as the Prime Minister had already told the Queen, it was "not the policy of this country to make engagements except in a view of the circumstances of the moment."

Events moved rapidly on the Continent after Palmerston's death. Prussia defeated Austria and drove her out of the Germanic Confederation. Then Prussia turned round, and, with the help of the other German States, defeated the French, and established a German Empire, with the King of Prussia at its head. The disasters which the French experienced caused the downfall of the French Empire and the setting up of the Republic. During this period England pursued the line of strict neutrality. The fact is that, with the development of European States which had taken place since 1815, it had become impossible for England or for any other Power to act alone, and the question for solution was whether it was better for England to withdraw

altogether from European complications, or whether her interests required her to form an alliance with one or more of the States on the mainland of Europe. At this time the answer given was in favour of a "splendid isolation." Subsequently, however, we realised that it is impossible to cut out Europe from the world and attempt to deal with our Imperial problems without taking her into account. The growth of the feeling that our Colonies were tied to us by bonds light as air, but strong as iron; the repudiation of the doctrine that Colonies were like fruit, and when ripe would drop off; and the world-wide expansion of trade, commerce, and banking have made the world one and indivisible as far as our interests and duties are concerned.

By 1874 France had paid off the heavy indemnity imposed upon her, and her rapid recovery alarmed the new Germany so much that she was accused of preparing for another attack upon France. But the intervention of Russia in conjunction with Great Britain prevented Germany from making her threatened attack. Doubts have sometimes been thrown on the reality of this crisis of 1875; but extracts from the memoirs of Prince Hohenlohe, edited after his death by Friedrich Curtius, and condemned by the German Emperor as "tactless and indiscreet in the highest degree," disclose the anxiety of Germany to isolate France, and produce a collision "between the English and French locomotives." Bismarck was afraid that France would use the time of the "Kultur-Kampf," which was then troubling German statesmen, to press on the policy of retaliation. Hence the statement in the *Berlin Post* in 1875 that "War was in sight." Russia and England both hastened to prevent such a catastrophe, and Lord Derby said that England would not allow any fresh humiliation of France.

Meanwhile the Conservative leader, Disraeli, who was Prime Minister from 1874 to 1880, had thrown over the policy of non-intervention. The rising of the Balkan States against the Turks in 1876 caused Russia to cross the Danube in support of the insurgents, and the Turks might have been restricted to very narrow limits in Europe, had not England and Austria intervened; for England was determined that the Russians should not have Constantinople, and Austria feared Russian influence in the Balkan peninsula. This support of Turkey was accompanied by the British occupation of Cyprus, an island regarded as the key to the Suez Canal, in which Great Britain had secured a controlling interest by the

purchase of the Khedive's shares in November, 1875. Russia found herself bound to submit the settlement of the Eastern question to the Great Powers, and the Treaty of Berlin, 1878, was the result. It was a most disastrous settlement—or rather attempt at a settlement—and in it are to be found the germs of many of the present troubles.

To begin with, the greater Bulgaria, which Russia had mapped out, was cut much smaller, and the size of Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro was also reduced. But most objectionable of all to the Slav mind was the definite handing over to Austrian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina; for thus Austria was given a foothold in these Slav districts, to the grave prejudice of Serbia in her natural expansion towards the Adriatic. It was on his return from perpetrating this treaty that Lord Beaconsfield declared that he had brought back "peace with honour." Grandiloquent words, but the racy language of his colleague, Lord Salisbury, uttered much later, seems nearer the truth, when he said that in supporting the Turk we had "backed the wrong horse."

Now, the atrocities committed by the Turks in Bulgaria in 1876 raised a storm of opposition to Turkey in England, and the result was that the Liberals, led by Mr. Gladstone, came into power in 1880. Mr. Gladstone's contribution to foreign policy was his teaching that a country, like an individual, has a conscience, and that England's duty was to inculcate a higher standard of international morals among European nations. Such a view of our duties abroad requires to be most delicately handled, or the ideals of the high-souled enthusiast will appear to the Philistines nothing else than the schemings and preachings of a hypocrite.

Meanwhile, European alliances had undergone a change since Germany crushed France. Bismarck was anxious to come to a friendly understanding with Prussia's old enemy, Austria, and he also desired to cultivate the friendship of Russia. His policy resulted in an alliance between the three Emperors in 1872. But this was of short duration, for Russia's assistance to the Slavs in the Balkans proved dangerous to Austrian schemes for expansion. The Treaty of Berlin was a slap in the face for Russia, and entirely alienated her from Germany. The latter country signed a new alliance with Austria in 1879. The next step was to bring in Italy. At first sight it is not obvious why Italy, the old enemy of Austria, should come in to the alliance. Besides, Bismarck encouraged France to assume the Protectorate

of Tunis in 1881—a movement distinctly prejudicial to Italian interests. But Germany made it clear that Italy would get no support unless she joined Prussia and Austria; and so the Triple Alliance was formed in 1883 and subsequently renewed in 1891, 1896, 1902, and 1912.

In spite of the Triple Alliance, however, Bismarck still tried to placate Russia, and in 1884 and in 1887 he bound her by a "Reinsurance Compact" for mutual neutrality in case of attack by a third party. It was concluded apart from Austro-Hungary, and was certainly directed against her. In spite of the renewals of the Triple Alliance, the interests of the three allies were not identical. Italy considered that the Trentino and the countries on the north-east of the Adriatic should belong to her, and Austria's expansion on that sea endangered the naval power of Italy. Moreover, Italy had outgrown her fear of France; and after her annexation of Tripoli in 1911, it became more and more essential for her to be on friendly terms with France and England, since their combined fleets were all-powerful in the Mediterranean. France, for some time after 1870, remained isolated. She was absorbed in experiments in home government after the terrible war of 1870-1, and it was Bismarck's policy to keep her cut off from alliances. But this proved impossible, especially after the alienation of Russia from Austria in 1878. In 1889 France gave Russia pecuniary assistance, and by 1894 the alliance between these two countries was an accomplished fact.

We can now return to the attitude of Great Britain. From 1878 until 1890 the main feature of English foreign policy was a marked desire for friendship with Germany. There were many reasons for this attitude. First of all there was our distrust of Russian intrigues in Turkey, and subsequently in Afghanistan. Then the entrance of our friend Italy (1883) into the Austro-German Alliance facilitated a friendly understanding with the Triple Alliance, whilst the steady opposition of France to our position in Egypt also worked in the same direction. This hostility was particularly annoying, as we had not in any way desired to undertake the work of keeping Egypt in order by ourselves. The task had been assigned to France and England by the Great Powers in 1879, but when difficulties arose in 1882 France left England in the lurch. Lord Salisbury in 1886 recognised the necessity of an understanding with Germany, and for many years our position in Egypt depended on the good-will of the Triple Alliance.

Between 1890 and 1900 we seemed to oscillate violently between the two European groups. At one time our statesmen talked of war with both France and Russia and also of an alliance with Germany, and in 1899 Lord Salisbury attempted to bring about an entente between Great Britain, Germany, and the United States. At another time we seemed to regard Germany as the author of all evil; and her entry into the field of colonial expansion in Africa after 1884, the Kruger telegram of 1896, her rapid commercial expansion, the opening of the Kiel Canal in 1895, and the development of her naval programme after 1898 all caused us to doubt the advantages of our policy of "splendid isolation."

Early in 1900 the air was full of rumours of a combined intervention of all the European Powers against us in the war which we were waging against the Boers in South Africa. During that struggle Germany, France, Austria, and Russia were all equally unfriendly to us, for to all we seemed "a dangerous, incalculable, unassimilable factor, which could not be harmonised with any European scheme, which would join no alliance, profess no fixed principles of policy, and respect none of the conventions or conveniences of the Great Powers." The risks we ran during the Boer War made it advisable that we should try to come to some agreement with France, for it was chiefly with France that our interests clashed all over the world, in Egypt, in the Soudan, in Newfoundland, as well as in Madagascar, West Africa, Morocco, and Siam. The world was dangerous without allies, and isolation was no longer feasible if we were determined to protect our Colonies and dependencies. Yet with alliances we must be ready to offer assistance; otherwise, asking for much and promising little, we should obtain nothing. This explains our entente with France in 1904, one which, however, was not at the time looked upon as an unfriendly act towards Germany. But by the Entente we agreed, as Italy had done in 1902, to give France the free hand in Morocco which France had given Italy in Tripoli.

In 1905 a French mission was sent to Morocco to urge a scheme of reform. Germany intervened, claiming to be concerned in the integrity and independence of Morocco, and complaining that she had not been a party to the arrangements made by England and France. The Sultan called the Berber chiefs to discuss the French proposals, but they would have nothing to do with the French on account of the French annexation of the Tuat and Figig districts for the better security of their Algerian

hinterland. On March 31st, 1905, the German Emperor arrived at Tangier to assert the equality of German commercial rights with those of other Powers; he was able to pose as the champion of the policy of the "Open Door," and to declare his determination to maintain direct relations with the Sultan as a free sovereign of a free country, whilst the Sultan was also given to understand that he could obtain a loan from Germany. There followed more risings in Morocco, and the Sultan was saved by the arrival of some French troops. At the same time the British declared that they would support the French under the treaty made in April, 1904—such support in no way prejudicing the rights of third parties. More troubles ensued, and the Sultan, prompted doubtless by Germany, proposed a Conference of the Powers. Great Britain and the other Powers declined unless France was ready to agree. M. Delcassé, the French Foreign Minister, wished to refuse this proposal, but his colleagues thought that such a provocation to Germany should be avoided. So M. Delcassé resigned, and a Conference was held at Algeciras in January, 1906. The year 1905 was one in which the German Emperor on several occasions let loose a very indiscreet tongue, and the events leading up to the visit to Tangier caused a widespread fear that Germany was throwing down a direct challenge to France and England.

Under ordinary circumstances the German attitude might have meant no more than a strong protest at not having been consulted by France and England in a matter of European concern; but in April, 1904, Count Buelow had stated that Germany had no objection to the agreement, as her interests were in no way imperilled by it. After this statement there is reasonable ground for suspicion that Germany's action was due to the fact that Russia was crippled by her disasters in the war with Japan, and that Germany took this opportunity of trying to upset French influence in Morocco. This intervention may be considered as the first appearance of the "mailed fist," and Englishmen came to think that a strong Russia was essential to the equilibrium of the West; for the advent of the petrol-motor and the ever-increasing value of Russian corn made us feel that we could never allow an Austro-German combination to lock up Russia in the Black Sea and cut off her valuable exports to Western Europe. So in 1907 we concluded an agreement with Russia, which ultimately led to the formation of the "Triple Entente." But our entente with Russia did not prevent Germany from coming in 1910 to an amicable agreement with Russia about Persia. The Entente was

the work of the Liberal Ministry, which came into office in December, 1905, but carried on the foreign policy of its predecessors; for party changes do not operate so unfavourably to our international consistency as is usually supposed.

For six years British interests in Europe had been jeopardised by the Russo-Japanese war and by the revolution in Russia which followed it; and the uneasy policy of Germany had caused us to draw nearer and nearer to France and Russia. In 1911 the disorders in Morocco again gave Germany an excuse for intervening, on the assumption that the French were ignoring the agreements concluded at Algeciras; and the German gunboat *Panther* was sent to Agadir in the hope that such a threat would break up the Triple Entente. But the sudden withdrawal of French capital from German banks, coupled with the steady support which Great Britain gave to France, caused the German Government to take a more cautious line, and the *Panther* was recalled. Negotiations followed, in which Germany made demands which no French Government could have granted—but finally in return for an acknowledgment of the French protectorate in Morocco Germany received from France a strip of territory, extending the German Cameroons on the south and east.

It has been objected that in this Moroccan business we were made a cat's-paw for French adventure. But we cannot agree with this view. Germany was obviously trying to obtain a foothold in Morocco; and it is evident, if we look at the position of Morocco on the map, that we could not allow her to attain this object. We are also accused of encouraging France to break the arrangements made at Algeciras. But the stable conditions, under which alone a literal interpretation of the treaty would be possible, no longer existed; and neither Germany nor any other country would have held itself literally bound to articles which presupposed conditions that no longer existed. No one will blame Germany for "trying it on," as the schoolboy says. No one, least of all Germany, could blame France for securing her position in a land in which she had sunk life and treasure. We do not expect a man to remain on the crumbling edge of a precipice because he promised, while the ground was safe, not to turn aside on to his neighbour's land.

No account of British foreign policy, however slight, can omit the bare outlines of our attitude towards Russia with regard to India. The necessity of taking steps to safeguard our Indian Empire has been a commonplace with

both English parties, but there were two schools of thought as to what our Indian policy should be. One party was anxious to extend our rule into Afghanistan, to make a "scientific" military frontier, and to eliminate a "buffer" State, which was too unstable to afford any security. The other party wished to preserve and strengthen the Afghan power. In 1878 the former school had the upper hand; relations between this country and Russia became very critical, and the continued expansion of the latter Power in Central Asia and Persia between 1881 and 1885 again endangered peace. But the pacific temper of the Czar and of Gladstone enabled the two Governments to find a way out of the difficulty, though trouble once more threatened between 1891 and 1905 owing to Russian activities in the Pamirs. After that danger had been removed, Russian pressure passed to the Far East, and she was able to find a temporary outlet in the ice-free harbour of Port Arthur in 1898, whilst the attention of Great Britain was soon absorbed by the critical condition of affairs in South Africa.

It will be remembered that after the Boer War we decided that our splendid isolation was a mistake. Following up that line of thought, we made a defensive treaty with Japan in 1902, which was amplified and renewed in 1905; but this treaty was not to be operative in the event of a war between Japan and the United States. It appears from the papers of Baron Hayashi that we wished this to be a Triple Alliance of Great Britain, Japan, and Germany, but that scheme fell through, and the dual alliance was the result. This treaty has also been very much criticised from various points of view, but so far for ten years it has proved serviceable to each party.

We must now turn to the Balkan question. In 1908 the "Young Turk" revolution broke out, and Austria took advantage of the confusion which arose to annex the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which she had administered since 1878. Now, this annexation might have been considered regular, if it had been done with the consent of the Great Powers; but it was distinctly "out of order" to annex the districts without that consent. This action of Austria was fraught with the most serious consequences, for it shut the door to all chance of Serbia reaching the Adriatic, besides definitely handing over a large body of Slavs to the hated Austrian, and it was undoubtedly one of the immediate causes of the present war. Russia was intensely annoyed by this anti-Slav move, but she did not feel strong enough to act; and so Austria, with Germany "in shining

armour" at her side, was able to disregard the protests of Great Britain and of the other European Powers.

We have been accused of standing in the way of German expansion. We do not pretend that we have always maintained the high standard which we have set for ourselves. There have been occasional lapses, but on the whole we can say that our policy has been "Live and let live"; and certainly an occasional lapse in the past is no excuse for refusing to pursue a right course in the present under the plea that, having fallen from our ideal, we are unfit to undertake any task that duty appears to demand. Of course at times all the big Powers have stood on one another's toes. In the crowded state of the world it is impossible to avoid such contretemps. Also there are certain districts over which we must keep a tight hand in the interest of our overseas Empire. But really Germany's quarrel is with Fate, and not with us. She was born late in the European family, and we might easily have had a share in strangling her at her birth. She grew with great rapidity, and her foreign trade throve under our free trade system. Her foreign policy, since Bismarck ceased to direct it, has been aggressive rather than defensive. Only recently it has been shown that the second Balkan war was engineered by Austria and Germany, who induced Bulgaria to attack Serbia and Greece, and then spread the report that Serbia and Greece were the aggressors. In 1912 the new German Navy Law added a third squadron to the active fleet, and in 1913 a new Army Bill still further increased the land forces of the Central Empire.

Yet where our interests have not hopelessly clashed we have done what we could for Germany. We gradually came to an understanding with her over her Bagdad railway scheme, making her mistress of two-thirds of Asiatic Turkey, and we encouraged France to do the same. We announced publicly that rearrangements of Central Africa to Germany's advantage, obtained by negotiations with other Powers, would not be opposed by us. She held Damaraland (except Walfisch Bay), the Cameroons, Dahomey on the west, and the hinterland of Zanzibar on the east. We were willing that Portugal should dispose of her rights over South-West Africa to Germany. We admitted her equal rights in China, we gave way to her in Samoa, and we ceded to her Heligoland, whilst we incurred the fierce indignation of Australia by permitting her to seize the northern part of New Guinea. Further, we deliberately refused to provoke her by preparing a huge army for warfare on the Continent

of Europe. During the negotiations, which preceded the outbreak of the war, our Foreign Office exerted itself to its utmost to find a way of peace for Europe; but surely it is obvious that Germany made no attempt to keep a check on Austria. By the end of June, 1914, the Prussian military party had complete control over the Kaiser, his Government, and his people. It was not at all certain how the English Government would act. There was feverish anxiety in the minds of the French lest Great Britain should find herself unable to join her Allies. But the German invasion of Belgium drove us into war. Self-preservation, the claims of our Allies, the call of Belgium, all alike drove us—lovers of peace as well as lovers of war—to take up arms against the most pernicious tyranny that exists, the tyranny of a strong nation that will trample down everything to secure its own supremacy in the world.

The question which naturally forces itself upon our notice is "What about the future?" How are we to prevent the recurrence of another awful cataclysm? There is no simple answer to this, but there is no doubt that our foreign policy, to be successful, must have the support of the people at its back, and what we want is popular education in foreign politics, so that an enlightened criticism may support the efforts of our diplomatists. Not only is the United Kingdom responsible for the government of one-fourth of the population of the world, but it is dependent for its economic existence on the free entry of food and raw material, and on the markets of the world for the disposal of its manufactures; nor must we forget that its two great sources of wealth, shipping and banking, are of an international character. This work is very complicated and involved, and in these days of industrial expansion the field of interest spreads over the whole world. It has been pointed out that the Minister for Foreign Affairs is in the position of a trustee, and a trustee has no right to assume that those for whom he is acting are generous, but he must assume that they are just. In practice foreign policy is often merely a choice of evils, for we have to remember that in foreign affairs our Government can only negotiate with other Powers, it cannot give orders as it can in the conduct of affairs at home.

The success of foreign policy even now depends upon the right estimation of national forces, and this is a matter of greater knowledge. This fact is not yet realised by the English people themselves, but the German Government has recognised it, and has caused the Germans to be taught what it wishes them to

believe. English people have a heavy responsibility. They have to set themselves to understand the problems of foreign policy—a task which is in many ways difficult for an island people. It may be pertinent to recall a remark made by Mr. J. E. C. Bodley in contrasting the Frenchman with the Englishman. In ordinary times, he says, the French "Man in the Street" knows the names and personalities of the British and Russian Ambassadors in Paris, but not those of his own Minister of the Interior or Minister of Finance; while the English "Man in the Street," though prepared to criticise Home Secretaries and compare Chancellors of the Exchequer, does not even know the names of the Ambassadors of France or Germany. The Englishman must give much more serious thought to foreign affairs, or he will remain the dupe of everyone who shouts loud enough his simple remedy for the solution of the most complicated problem that it is the lot of man to face. It is no use complaining as you sit by the side of your broken engine that the engineer uses terms which you do not comprehend, and demanding that he should talk simply to you. The fault lies not in the engineer, but in the ignoramus, who, with excellent intentions, wishes to control a machine which he has not tried to understand.

W. J. Harte.

NOTES AND NEWS.

At a meeting of the Council, held on May 6, further progress was made towards a policy of co-operation with the Classical, English, Modern Languages, and Geographical Associations in the defence of humanistic studies; and Professor Tout, Mr. C. H. Greene, and Mr. C. H. K. Marten were appointed delegates to a joint conference between the five associations. The two following resolutions were also adopted by the Council :—

1. That the value of historical training consists only in part in the information conveyed; it lies chiefly in the training of the pupil to see through the details the main lines of historical development, and to understand something of the conditions—social, political, moral, intellectual, and economic—that have moulded the present. The study of history, moreover, provides valuable training in accurate reasoning, in the formation of thoughtful judgment, and in the expression of results in a clear and attractive form. Throughout the curriculum these aims should be kept in view by the teachers, due regard being paid to the stage the pupils have reached.

2. That the study of history should be approached through that of the political community in which the pupils live. It should be treated in relation to the history of the British Empire as a whole, the growth of which should form a more important part of the whole curriculum than it has done hitherto. The outlines of general history should be explained so as to make intelligible the development of civilisation and our relations with other peoples. It is advisable that in every grade of education—primary, secondary, and university—there should be increased study of recent history, care being taken to deal with events in an impartial and sober spirit.

* * * * * *

The general terms of these resolutions will probably commend themselves to most students of history, and of the two more specific recommendations that which advocates an increased study of recent history is hardly a matter of contention; for it has been generally admitted that the curtailing of historical study at the point, at which it provides the best means for understanding the current development of the world, is irrational and unfortunate. The other specific recommendation in favour of greater emphasis on the history of the British Empire may not meet with universal acceptance. Possibly it is due to the influence of the new Imperial Studies Committees, to which we alluded in our April number; and the London Committee at least

has succeeded in moving the University to modify some of its historical curricula. In and after the Session 1917-18, we learn from the *University Gazette* of June 7, the history syllabus for the internal Intermediate examination will be "English History treated generally so as to include the growth of the British Empire," while to the regulations for the B.A. Pass degree there is to be appended the note: "Due attention should be paid to constitutional and Imperial development and to the course of foreign relations." Similar alterations may also be contemplated in the School-leaving, Matriculation, and Honours Degree courses. Whether they are adopted or not depends to some extent upon the activity or inertia of the Historical Association and its branches and upon the view taken of their wisdom.

* * * * * *

The doubt about the wisdom concerns a point tersely expressed by Miss Constance Stewart in a letter we printed in our last number. "We are apt to forget," she wrote, "that the history of other nations is just as important as our own": and she urged that unless the children "learn to appreciate and enter into their aims and ideals as well as our own . . . they will never be able to take a just and sane view of the claims of other nations, and will never attain that understanding and sympathy which are the only sure foundation of international peace."

* * * * * *

Another correspondent, Miss Frances Harris, emphasised the same need for the study of other national histories as well as our own Imperial history. Both naturally have "the children" in mind, not merely because they are teachers, but because ninety-nine per cent. of our adults acquire what little historical understanding they possess at school; and it may seem that it is a case of providing this understanding at school or nowhere, if it is to have any influence over the mass of voters. But the urgent problem is how to educate the parents, for many a vital problem of international politics will have to be settled before children now at school will have any voice in their determination; and we should like to suggest that, just as our universities have confined their vision too narrowly to undergraduates, so our teachers in schools needlessly limit their scope to their pupils. The teacher of history is probably more intelligent and certainly better informed on the causes of political problems than the average citizen. Why then should his or her knowledge be restricted to the school-room and to influencing future generations? Every teacher should be a source of light and leading to the locality in which he is placed;

and the interchange of ideas with the public would be good both for the public and for the teacher. What University Professors try to do by means of public lectures might be done *mutatis mutandis* by every teacher in a school.

* * * * * *

We suggested in our last number that the activities of various University Imperial Studies Committees opened up possibilities in this direction. We are glad now to call attention to another organisation expressly designed to provide against that adult ignorance of other national histories which Miss Stewart and Miss Harris lament in school children. We have received from the Council for the Study of International Relations, of which Lord Bryce is the chairman, a number of its publications explaining its aims and methods and containing all sorts of information and views on the various countries concerned in the war.

* * * * * *

The first class of publications, some of which are distributed gratis, while others cost a penny or twopence, deals with the organisation of the Council and the formation of study circles. The second consists of "Aids to Study," and comprises: (1) "Notes on the Countries at War," indicating the main points in their government, history, population, and policy; (2) "Outline Syllabuses on Some Problems of the War," dealing with the "historical background," the "economics of the war," "recent British foreign policy," the British Empire, and the "map of Europe"; (3) "British Foreign Policy; a Scheme of Study"; (4) "The Causes of the War; What to Read"—an admirably full bibliography; and (5) "War and Democracy: a Scheme of Study." The third class of publications deals with specific questions, such as "Serbia's Place in Human History," "The Problem of Small Nations in the European Crisis," by Dr. T. G. Masaryk, formerly Professor at Prague and now Professor in the University of London; "Italy and the Jugo-slav Peoples," and "The War and the Settlement, an Italian View," by Eugenio Rignano, with a critical introduction by Professor Ramsay Muir. More substantial volumes, published independently, can be obtained from the Council at half their published price. The address of the Council is 1 Central Buildings, Tothill Street, Westminster, S.W.

* * * * * *

The defect about all these beneficent organisations is their lack of co-ordination. That, indeed, is a common characteristic of English administration; but it ill becomes us to gird at the want of co-ordination in our government, if we do nothing to co-

ordinate where we can without depending on government; and the work of the Council for the Study of International Relations, the various Imperial Studies Committees, and the Historical Association is so intimately connected that to pursue it on independent lines involves no little waste of energy and efficiency. Mr. Hubert Hall has in the May *Contemporary Review* a paper on "National Service for Historians"; a branch secretary of the Historical Association who could co-ordinate historical education in his district would be rendering more than a local service.

* * * * * *

Meanwhile the war provides constant illustration of the need of historical education, the latest example being the interpretation placed by the Press (with two exceptions) on the news of the North Sea battle on May 31. An admiral has since accounted for that significant failure of our instructors to interpret naval intelligence by asserting that "the public never has, and never will, understand naval warfare." It is not surprising that countries which have had no naval history worth mention should fall victims to German misrepresentation and accept the German estimate of the affair. But it would be a depressing thought that the British people, who depend for their very existence upon sea-power, should never understand naval warfare; and democratic control would clearly be but a synonym for political suicide so long as that condition obtains. It must, however, obtain so long as our University authorities make no provision for the education of the public in naval history.

* * * * * *

Neglect is, however, preferable to the kind of attention which the German State pays to history and historians. Historical truth, like every other form of truth, is to the Prussian the handmaid of the State. Napoleon paid history the compliment of considering it dangerous—unlike mathematics or the physical sciences—unless it was properly written and taught under the control of Government; and if facts or professors come into conflict with the German State, so much the worse for them. Such is the maxim that has recently been applied to two distinguished professors of history at Ghent, M. Pirenne and M. Paul Frédéricq. M. Pirenne is best known by his splendid *Histoire de Belgique*, the fourth volume of which comes down to 1648; he has also been Ford Lecturer at Oxford. M. Paul Frédéricq is the editor of a monumental work on the Inquisition in the Netherlands. Both were required by the German Government to assist in converting Ghent into a "Flemish" university; that

is to say, into a university which would be a focus of German influence and of disloyalty to Belgium. For German interest in Flemish is akin to German interest in the Sinn Fein movement; and German devotion to the lesser tongues of little peoples abroad goes hand-in-hand with the whipping of Polish children in Germany for using their native language. Both the Ghent professors refused to lend themselves to German purposes, and have been removed to Germany for internment. Their more fortunate colleague, Professor L. Van der Essen, of Louvain, who escaped at the beginning of the war, has just been appointed Director of the Belgian School at Rome. We hope his new post will enable him to prosecute further his researches into the Farnese archives, which promise to throw much light on the history of his own and other countries in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

* * * * * *

Yet another aspect of German historical propaganda is illustrated by an article in *De Toekomst* which appeared last January. *De Toekomst* is an ostensibly Dutch weekly started in the spring of 1915 to advertise *Kultur*; and it contained an article by Baron van Vredenburch, in which our contemporary, *The English Historical Review*, was held up as a living witness to the debt which English historical scholarship owes to the inspiration of German learning. Its first editor, Bishop Creighton, and Lord Acton are singled out as special representatives of German ideas, while Stubbs is regarded as a sort of pale reflection of Gneist. Students of the *English Historical Review* will be amused at these pretensions so redolent of Herr Houston Stewart Chamberlain. But there is excellent authority for stating that Creighton modelled the *English Historical Review* on the *Archivio Storico Italiano*, a much older periodical than the *Historische Zeitschrift*, and that his intellectual affinities were Italian; indeed, no intelligent reader of the *History of the Papacy* could have any doubts on the matter. As for Lord Acton, few things were more distasteful to him than modern Prussianised Germany; he was all for the control of the State by the subject, and against the control of the subject by the State; and the last sentence of his lecture on "The Rise of Prussia" has a prophetic ring to-day:—

"That is the tremendous power, supported by millions of bayonets, which grew up in the days of which I have been speaking at Petersburg, and was developed, by much abler minds, chiefly at Berlin; and it is the greatest danger that remains to be encountered by the Anglo-Saxon race."

NOTICES.

The Council has decided to allow Public Libraries to purchase the publications of the Association and to subscribe to HISTORY at members' rates without paying members' subscriptions. It is hoped that this concession will enable the publications of the Association to find their way into all public libraries of repute.

The Illustrations Committee desires to remind members that it would be glad to receive gifts of photographic prints, slides, and disused negatives of buildings, places and objects of historic interest, particularly such as have been used as aids in teaching history. It hopes in time to form a collection from which members can borrow illustrations for their history lessons.

We are asked to announce that, in conjunction with the Woodbrooke Extension Committee and the National Adult School Union, Mr. F. S. Marvin is again arranging the programme for a Summer School (August 5–14th) on "Progress in History." Among those who have promised to speak are Professors Gilbert Murray, J. A. Smith, and L. P. Jacks, Messrs. A. J. Carlyle, R. R. Marett, and A. E. Zimmern. All applications should be made to Mr. Edwin Gilbert, 54 Woodbrooke Road, Bournville.

Contributors are advised that articles for HISTORY should not exceed 4,000 words in length, reviews 600 words, short notices 300 words, and letters to the Editor 300 words. The Editor cannot be responsible for the return of MS. unless it is accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope.

CORRESPONDENCE.

RAILWAYS *versus* REFORM BILLS.

SIR,

We have heard with pleasure Sir Charles Lucas's breezy call in your April number to the heights of an Imperial vision of history; and some of us who teach in schools are hoping to mount the slopes of Pisgah as far as our headmasters, education authorities, external examiners, and the general host of Philistines will permit us. But there is one note in his slogan which seems a little out of tune. No one will deny the need for a fuller treatment of the history of scientific progress in our history text-books, and I remember you, Sir, saying in a lecture many years ago that you would like to see a history of England which devoted as much space to the founding of the Royal Society as to the Popish Plot. But Sir Charles proceeds to a comparison: "In the history," he writes, "of the rise of democracy, in the United Kingdom as throughout the world, what a twopenny-halfpenny thing is a Reform Bill compared with railways! Democracy is the direct result of scientific invention: printing, railways, telegraphs, bicycles made democracy inevitable. It was not Acts of Parliament that worked the change, it was scientific invention."

Was it really so? Earlier in his paper Sir Charles reminded us that "of all peoples of the present day, the Germans are the most dominated by science." Then, if scientific invention made democracy

inevitable, why has not their science made democrats of the Germans? Sir Charles seems to have succumbed for the nonce to a subtle form of scientific suggestion. Railways and the rest did not and cannot make democracy or any other form of government, for government is a matter of opinion, mind, and spirit, while scientific invention is confined to the sphere of physical forces. Railways, telegraphs, bicycles, and printing are merely the instruments of men; there were democracies before any of these things were invented, and there are tyrannies still. No doubt science is a help to democracies, but it is no less a help to despots. It facilitates control, but does nothing to determine whether control shall be popular or tyrannical. Science is indifferent to politics and to principles; it serves impartially any cause that pays it, and like the Arts at the Renaissance it finds better patrons in princes than in parliaments.

Yours faithfully,
C. W. S.

A correspondent, G. D. T., asks for an explanation of the term "Jugo-Slav." It comes, we believe, from *jug*, which is the Serbo-Croatian for *south*, and is used to distinguish the Slavs of the Balkans, Croatia, and Hungary from the Russians, Poles, and Czechs. The Croatian language is almost identical with Serbian, except that it uses Roman characters while Serbian uses Cyrillian Greek.

C. S. P. sends an equally topical inquiry: "We all know the origin of the *Marseillaise*, but when and by whom was *La Brabançonne* written?" Without committing ourselves to the statement of our correspondent, we may answer the question by saying that the latest edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica" (xix., 266) ascribes *La Brabançonne* to F. Campenhout, but that Professor Van der Essen ("History of Belgium," p. 153) ascribes it to Jenneval, one of the volunteers from Louvain who joined the revolutionists at Brussels in 1830 and defended it successfully against the troops of their sovereign, King William I. of the Netherlands.

E. S. C. desires to know the best means of obtaining Continental books, pamphlets, and other literature on the genesis of the war. Probably a number of booksellers in neutral countries have made a specialty of this sort of business, but the one best known to us is Martinus Nijhoff, Publisher, The Hague. Our correspondent would, in seeking to gratify his thirst for knowledge, have, of course, to reckon with the Censor, if not also with the law against trading with the enemy; but licence is sometimes allowed to seekers after truth.

Mrs. B. asks a question we cannot answer: "Who first called England 'perfide Albion'?" Perhaps some reader can oblige.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

The Influence of Ancient Egyptian Civilization in the East and in America. By G. Elliot Smith, F.R.S. 8vo. Pp. 32, 3 plates. 1916. Longmans. 1s. n.

This pamphlet is an exposition of part of the great claims to historic reconstruction which have lately been put forward. The evidences asserted for the descent of other civilizations from that of Egypt vary much in their nature. The main division is between those of utilitarian and of artistic purpose. When we consider the unquestionable cases of similar materials and necessities producing similar results, there is little value as evidence in the use of metals, of shipping, of megalith building, weaving linen, pearl-fishing, incense, or stone seats. These, and many other things, are likely to arise merely from the experimental use of materials at hand. Living in our stereotyped civilization, with sub-divided labour binding everyone to use what is provided or demanded by others, we can hardly imagine the experimental ways of man when he does everything for himself. It is curious to watch a less-constrained man vaguely trying all sorts of possibilities, most of which one may see to be impossible at a glance; yet, with or without reason, he is always trying something, in hopes that a benefit may follow. Thus an invention, which may only be made in a thousand years of trials, is just as likely to originate in ten different countries as in one. Provided the material, and the desirability of the result, invention is as likely in a dozen places as in one country only.

The case is quite different in matters of artistic resemblance. There is no external guide as to whether a people shall prefer spiral pattern or fret pattern, a rosette or Solomon's seal, flamboyant curves or Arab tracery. The subject of the inherence of taste in races, or as influenced by countries, is deeply interesting. It is assisted no doubt by natural surroundings and facilities of work, but cannot be said to be a spontaneous product of such guidance. In these lines some resemblances, pointed out by Dr. Elliot Smith from previous writers, certainly suggest connections between Egypt and America. Yet this does not at all prove the main thesis, that the moving cause was Phœnician trade. There are other connections quite as marked as far back as 1400 B.C. in the Old World, and again of the seventh century A.D. with Italy, by way of the Syrian mission to China. That there has been artistic (and therefore general) influence from the Old World to the New has long been supposed, and fresh instances have come to light, though not much in Dr. Smith's works, which have repeated past observations regarding designs. On the whole, if the Phœnician hypothesis is to be taken as the main matter, it will obscure rather than help us to understand the various relations which may be traced and which give good ground for crediting repeated, though transient, connections between the hemispheres. It is well that the obscure con-

nections between peoples should be re-discussed from time to time; but what we may hope is that some archæologist, thoroughly saturated with Asiatic styles and motives, will discuss American art from that point of view. The increased care for Chinese art in the United States is a good promise for such a study in future.

W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE.

A Short History of Belgium. By LÉON VAN DER ESSEN, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of History in the University of Louvain. Chicago University Press.[1] 1916. Pp. 168. 4*s.* n.

FEW historians can write on the history of Belgium with greater authority than M. Van der Essen, who escaped from Louvain at the end of August, 1914, and has since been lecturing in England and America; and the tragic circumstances under which this little book has been written give point to a history only less tragic than that of Poland. Probably the happiest and most fruitful period of Belgian history was during the middle ages before Belgium attained its late-born political independence or even achieved, under Spanish and Austrian rule, a national existence. Its people found fullest expression in communal and provincial rather than in national life; and their art, religion, industry, and literature gave them a place in European history which was independent of national organisation. There was no State called Belgium until the formation of the Dutch Republic out of seven of the seventeen provinces, which the Dukes of Burgundy and their successors, the Hapsburgs, had united under their sway, drove the remaining ten into a rival union under their Spanish rulers. That separation was one of the great tragedies in Belgian history. The ten southern provinces had equal grievances with the Dutch against Philip II., and had taken the lead in the revolt; but they were Catholic, and when they were compelled in 1576–9 to choose between their religion and national independence, they preferred to remain Catholic under Philip II. rather than become Protestant with William of Orange.

M. Van der Essen tells that story from a different point of view from that which Motley and Froude have made familiar to English and American readers. Being Protestants as well as nationalists, they found an easy course for the flow of their sympathies. Professor Van der Essen is distracted, like his sixteenth-century countrymen, between the claims of religion and political independence; and fidelity to Catholicism did not save Belgium from the consequences of subjection to a decadent Spanish monarchy. For a brief period, under the semi-independent rule of the Archdukes Albert and Isabella (1598–1621), Belgium enjoyed prosperity and self-respect; but on their death without issue it reverted to Spain, became the cockpit of Europe, and the scapegoat of Spanish incompetence; for it was with Belgian territory that Spain paid the price of its failures against France and Holland, and on the north and on the south Belgium was pared of provinces. The Peace of Utrecht transferred her to the Austrian Hapsburgs, but saddled her with a Dutch garrison for her Barrier fortresses, which, however, failed to bar the advance of the French in 1745–7. Catholicism and provincialism led the Belgians to revolt once more

[1] English agents: the Cambridge University Press, Fetter Lane, E.C.

against the rationalistic and centralising policy of Joseph II. in 1788–9, only to fall under the dominion of the free-thinking and still more centralising rule of the French Republic and Napoleon. Belgium had never yet enjoyed a national status, and it did not occur to the Congress of Vienna to confer it; so Belgium was yoked with Holland under the rigidly Protestant and autocratic rule of William I. After fifteen years of uneasy union the French Revolution of 1830 gave the signal for another in Belgium; this time the Powers agreed to recognise Belgian nationality, Leopold of Saxe-Coburg was chosen king, and William I. was compelled to acquiesce. But so small a realm threatened to become again the cockpit of Europe, and a temptation to ambitious neighbours; and so the famous "scrap of paper" was drafted in 1839 to guarantee Belgian neutrality. After eighty-four years of national independence Belgium fell a prey to its fifth foreign despot—Spaniard, Austrian, Frenchman, Dutch, German—and the only neighbour which has never annexed Belgium intervened in the war in the hope of securing for Belgian independence a firmer foundation than it has yet possessed.

We cannot pretend to concur in all that M. Van der Essen says, but his book is valuable as a Belgian's presentation of Belgian history. Down to the middle of the seventeenth century it is based on the masterly history of M. Pirenne; but students who have not access to M. Pirenne's volumes will find a useful companion to M. Van der Essen's book in Mr. R. C. K. Ensor's History of Belgium in the Home University Library.

A. F. POLLARD.

British History: From the Earliest Times to the Present Day. By L. CECIL SMITH, M.A. Part I. To 1485. Pp. 169; App., pp. xlviii.; 15 maps; and index. 2*s.* 6*d.* Part II. 1485–1912. Pp. 546; App., pp. xlviii.; 26 maps and index. Rivingtons. 3*s.* 6*d.*

THESE volumes follow traditional lines as regards arrangement, the matter being divided according to reigns with sub-divisions for each reign. The Appendices consist of short outlines of English Literature, the Machinery of Government, English Architecture, and the Navy, together with a short note on the Palatine Counties. There is also a brief sketch of the causes leading up to the present war. Altogether there is a remarkable amount of detail compressed into a comparatively small space.

The work is intended for older pupils, and, as is inevitable in a work of this kind, it assumes the guidance of a teacher who is familiar with his subject. For instance, in speaking of the religious affairs in Scotland in the reign of James I., the author says: "In 1621 the Assembly accepted 'The Five Articles' which almost completed the process" (*i.e.*, the process of reviving a modified form of Episcopalian Government). To convert that statement into real historical knowledge requires far more elucidation and illustration than is possible in a text-book.

The sketch maps would afford greater assistance if placed together at the end of each volume. As is so often the case with historical maps, several of these are misleading. The map of Eastern and

Central America in 1755 is a case in point. A rigid boundary alone cannot express the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht with regard to the boundary between Nova Scotia and the French territory. Briefly, the facts are as follows: the whole of Acadia "according to the ancient limits" was ceded to Britain. Practically the whole of the evidence shows that Acadia had been regarded as running back to the Canada River (St. Lawrence) and had been so defined by the French plenipotentiaries at the negotiations preceding the Treaty of Utrecht. The only part effectively occupied by the English was the southern end—round Annapolis—of the peninsula. All the other remained in dispute. The boundary, therefore, should be carried back to the River St. Lawrence—the whole should be marked Acadia—the southern end of the peninsula should be marked as definitely English, and a footnote of some kind should indicate that the precise boundaries were disputed.

The map of the Industries of England is another case. The names of the industries are written across the map. As a consequence, some of them are out of place. It is better to use symbols with an explanatory key, as these can be more accurately placed.

It is refreshing to find the author boldly challenging the traditional whig views of history.

JOS. A. WHITE.

The Balkans: a History of Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, Rumania, Turkey. By NEVILL FORBES, ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE, D. MITRANY, D. G. HOGARTH. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. 5*s.* n.

IN spite of the Balkan Wars of 1912–13 there are few areas of the world war of to-day in which the average citizen is more hopelessly at sea than the south-eastern peninsula of Europe, which was once Turkey in Europe, and is now so divided that its States have sought a common denominator in a range of mountains; and the popular and vulgar weekly, which in the last week of July, 1914, filled its placards with the imprecation "to hell with Servia," appealed to a public that was all the more sympathetic because it had but a hazy idea where or what Serbia was, and had no intention of going there. Even intelligent students of history might easily go adrift in the turbulent cross-currents of Balkan politics, and the most fervent advocate of democratic control over foreign policy might shudder on the brink of a referendum on Balkan issues and Great Britain's duty therein. Fortunately, or unfortunately, we shall be spared that folly, but those who believe that democratic influence on foreign policy can only come of democratic understanding of foreign politics may be grateful for the admirable sketches of Balkan history which Mr. Hogarth has collected in this volume.

It is a field that is full of pitfalls, and passion as well as ignorance leads men into them. Mr. Hogarth has been judicious in his selection of collaborators, and their work is on the whole judicious and balanced. The whole-hearted partisans, whether of Serbia, Greece, or Bulgaria, have been avoided; and the case for Bulgaria has not been left to the Buxtons, nor that of Serbia to Dr. Seton-Watson. The fact that Mr. Nevill Forbes deals both with Serbia and Bulgaria makes harmony in these pages more possible than it would have been if the authorship had been divided; and the circumstance that

the chapters on Bulgaria and Greece were written before the treachery of Ferdinand and the apostasy of Constantine enables their authors to write in a judicial frame of mind. Mr. Hogarth himself is equally dispassionate with the Turk. No one, indeed, has any enmity to the individual Turk, and probably he has none to us. The gang of adventurers, led by Enver, are in a different case; and they are doomed unless their natural allies, the Germans, win this war. Their fall, however, would hardly simplify the problem of the Ottoman heritage, and Mr. Hogarth has too extensive a knowledge of the Near East to seek a place among the prophets. M. Mitrany, who deals with Rumania, might be more suspected of partisanship; but he discounts such suspicion by his frank criticism of the policy adopted during the last three years by the Rumanian Government, which he blames for having succumbed to the bait of territorial compensation instead of taking its stand upon the principle of nationality. His analysis of Rumanian parties and politics is of material assistance towards understanding and estimating the future course of Rumanian action. Mr. Toynbee is not quite so helpful with regard to Greece; clearly the influence of the court at Athens has been an incalculable factor, and the newspapers, either because it is their nature or because the Censor has prevented them from doing otherwise, have simply darkened counsel, and left us without a key to the understanding of Greek politics. The main function, however, of these sketches is historical, not political; they succeed in giving a clear outline of the principal features in the development of the Balkan States, and put us in a position to grasp the meaning of Balkan news and the complexity of the Balkan imbroglio.

A. F. POLLARD.

The Critical Period, 1763–1765, and *The New Régime*, 1765–1767. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by CLARENCE WALWORTH ALVORD, of the University of Illinois, and CLARENCE EDWIN CARTER, of Miami University. Illinois State Historical Library. British Series, Vols. I. and II. Pp. lvii + 597 and xxviii + 700. Springfield, Ill. 1915–16.

THESE two handsome volumes are the earliest in a series in which it is proposed to collect and print complete most of the extant documents relating to the history of the old North-West during the period between its cession to Great Britain by the Treaty of Paris and the year 1778, when it came into the possession of the infant United States. The volumes do honour both to the best traditions of American scholarship and to those who have been entrusted with the form of their production. Admirable alike in type, paper, and binding, they are almost a model of what a collection of documents should be, and the Trustees of the Illinois State Historical Library are to be congratulated upon their publication. The documents have been gathered from many sources; the Public Record Office and the Lansdowne MSS. in the British Museum have yielded the greatest store, while the Kaskaskia MSS., a recently-discovered collection of manuscripts from the old French villages along the Mississippi River, give a most interesting insight into the intimate life of the old French colonists under the British flag.

To English readers the papers are of great interest as throwing

an entirely new light upon the attitude of the British Government to American affairs during the critical period between the removal of the French menace and the Declaration of Independence, and they enable us to view in a truer perspective many of the difficulties that faced the Ministers who were responsible for the conduct of our Colonial policy in those fateful years. When, after Wolfe's great victory at Quebec and the Peace that followed, Canada became a British possession, there came, too, beneath our sway that vast region between the Great Lakes, the mountains, and the Mississippi, which after its exploration by La Salle in 1680 had come to be recognised as the strategic centre for the occupation of the whole of the West and had during the early years of the eighteenth century been gradually occupied by French settlers from Quebec. But little difficulty resulted from these peaceful colonists, and it was rather with the dangers from the warlike Indian tribes, like the Algonquins and the Delawares, and the rival traders from Louisiana and from the Eastern colonies that the authorities were troubled. The celebrated Proclamation of 1763 apparently forbade all settlement within the newly-acquired territory, but the documents here printed show that this was only a temporary prohibition, and that it was the plan of the Ministry to open up the whole region of the upper Ohio as soon as the Indians could be pacified. That this was no simple matter we have learned from Parkman's pages, but these volumes contain many documents that enable us to realise how great was the danger with which the British had to cope before the designs of the great Indian ruler Pontiac could be brought to naught. The editors disclaim any intention of re-writing the story of Pontiac's conspiracy, but their introduction, read in the light of the letters they print, cannot fail to clear up many of the points that were previously obscure.

While Amherst still remained as Commander-in-Chief, his policy of repression and of economy led him to neglect and override the suggestions of those who, like Sir William Johnson and his subordinates, were entrusted with the actual negotiations with the Indian chiefs. We cannot but sympathise with Amherst's desire to spare the pockets of the British tax-payer in carrying out a task to which, though it was of far more vital importance to them, the Eastern colonists refused to contribute; but his policy was productive of unfortunate results, and with his supersession by General Gage a freer rein was given to the action of the expert Superintendent of Indian Affairs. Ultimately matters were brought to a satisfactory footing, but only after a costly war, waged almost entirely by Regular troops and with very little colonial aid. In many ways, in fact, the colonists proved an active hindrance, as, for instance, when in 1765 a convoy of valuable presents, necessary to cement the agreement with the Indians, was attacked and destroyed by the "Paxton Boys," a band of Pennsylvanian frontiersmen who did not appreciate the necessity of the Government's policy and were incensed at the idea of giving valuable goods to the savages. The presents had, of course, to be replaced, and the wily storekeepers of the Quaker State must have chuckled at their opportunity to make a second comfortable profit at the expense of the stupid English. The great companies of land speculators from Pennsylvania and Virginia, among whom Colonel George Washington took so important a share, were, too, by no means easy to manage; and

when for the sake of broad considerations of Imperial policy the authorities were unable to permit them to have their unchecked way, a fresh chorus of complaint arose, and the motives of the Ministers in England were bitterly attacked.

And yet a general perusal of their letters, and especially of those of Lord Shelburne, is enough to convince us that the policy of Indian pacification and of gradual expansion, which was decided upon, had received the most honest and painstaking consideration, and was directed in the best interests of America as a whole and in the light of the fullest information afforded by the experts on the spot. We can no longer dismiss the Colonial administration of the period with a shallow acceptance of all the diatribes of its antagonists as a compound of slackness, inefficiency, and self-seeking tyranny; and we are compelled to a feeling of respect for that somewhat slow-going but essentially honest and well-meaning administration of colonial and native affairs, which we can regard as essentially British when we meet it in the nineteenth century and which we here find at work in entirely familiar grooves in the middle of the eighteenth. Messrs. Alvord and Carter state in their General Introduction to the series that their documents, although covering only a few years, will be found of great significance not only for the history of the State of Illinois and of the whole West, but also for the proper interpretation of American history. Yet even this statement is hardly wide enough, and it may be said that they throw light, too, on the course of British Colonial history as a whole and enable us to realise how the story of our old Empire and our new is one, and how, if we would read that story aright, we must regard the Declaration of Independence as only the end of a chapter rather than as the first words in a new story by a different hand.

ARTHUR PERCIVAL NEWTON.

The Teaching of History in Elementary Schools. By R. L. ARCHER, M.A., L. V. D. OWEN, B.A., and A. E. CHAPMAN, B.A. A. and C. Black. Pp. xii + 264. 3*s*. 6*d*. n.

PROFESSOR ARCHER, the Bangor educationist, and his colleagues have produced a book on the teaching of history which merits the attention not only of elementary teachers, for whom it is primarily intended, but of all who have to give instruction in history to children up to the age of fourteen. It is comprehensive, eminently moderate and sane in its judgments, and written in an easy, attractive style which makes the reading of it a pleasure.

Many of its sections follow familiar lines and call for no special comment. The writers, in common with most modern educationists, emphasise the importance of history as a factor in the training of citizens, and discuss the special services which it renders as a handmaid to politics. Incidentally they condemn, with a vigour which will command general assent on the part of teachers, that study of institutions apart from history which, under the name of "civics," has hung like a blight over many an English and American school for the last ten years or more.

It is in the discussion of the historical course suitable for children up to normal school-leaving age that the writers develop the most original views. They criticise with extreme severity that "con-

centric" system, favoured until recently by the Board of Education, according to which the complete circle of the history of England is taught at each stage of the pupils' career, each survey being made larger and more comprehensive than its predecessor. They contend that this system causes great chronological confusion in the minds of young students, destroys freshness and interest, prevents any definite impression of any period whatsoever from being stamped upon the imagination, and involves the teaching of much unsuitable matter in the lower standards of the schools. They advocate in place of the "concentric" system a "culture-epoch" plan, according to which the whole course of English history will be dealt with during the school career, but only once. They would teach the early history of the nation to young children, for its simple and primitive features render it the more easily intelligible to them; the later and more complex periods they would reserve to the closing years of school life. They strongly urge that each period in turn should be taught with sufficient fulness to leave a clear, definite, and permanent impression upon the mind of the learner.

They would not limit instruction strictly to English history. They consider that a general idea of the development of Western civilisation should be imparted. For this purpose, they argue, English history is very generally adequate: most of the great European movements have had their English aspects. But occasionally, they point out, some important Continental developments—*e.g.*, the Portuguese and Spanish explorations, the German Reformation, and the French Revolution—need to be treated from a European rather than from an English point of view. In illustration of this proposition the writers provide a detailed table of a course of study which should be of the greatest assistance to practical teachers who wish to make their syllabuses educationally adequate. They conclude their valuable book by discussing in detail the general features of each of the leading epochs of the history of the Christian era, and by recommending authorities for further reading.

F. J. C. HEARNSHAW.

SHORT NOTICES.

PROFESSOR TOUT'S lecture on "A Mediæval Burglary," which has already appeared in the *Bulletin* of the John Rylands Library for October, 1915, is now separately issued by Messrs. Longmans in an attractive form. The story of this burglary of the treasury of the King's wardrobe in Westminster Abbey on April 24th, 1303, is made the occasion for imparting some valuable information on Edward I.'s financial administration and many other constitutional points of interest.

An interesting, albeit anonymous, footnote to history is published by Messrs. Simpkin, Marshall in *The Identification of the Writer of the Anonymous Letter to Lord Monteagle in 1605* (1916: 4*s.* 6*d.* net, pp. ix, 28). The part which that letter played in the detection of the Gunpowder Plot is one of the few historical details

which "every school child" is erroneously supposed to know; and there has never been any real doubt of Francis Tresham's share in the communication of the warning to his brother-in-law, Lord Monteagle, not to attend the opening of Parliament on November 5th. But the "strange letter, from a strange hand, by a strange messenger, without date to it, name at it, and (I had almost said) sense in it," as Fuller described it, has always remained a mystery. Its existence was known, but hitherto its author has not been identified; this identification has now been made by a student, whose anonymity is less likely to escape detection than that of the writer of the letter sent to Monteagle. The writer appears to have been William Vavasour, a confidential servant and clerk of Francis Tresham; the letter was written in a disguised hand, and the disguise has misled previous investigators who have sought for the solution in a normal hand resembling that in which the famous letter is written. The clue has been discovered in another letter by Vavasour, written in a disguised handwriting similar to that in which he had written the letter to Monteagle. Circumstantial evidence points to Vavasour, but arguments from the similarity of disguised hands hardly justify the positiveness with which this identification is proclaimed; and if, as is contended, Vavasour was, above all things, anxious to conceal his authorship of the Monteagle letter, he is not likely to have written, in the presence of the Lieutenant of the Tower, a letter to the Government in a writing "identical with the writing of the anonymous letter" (p. 3). The author of this monograph expresses, but does not substantiate, the more interesting opinion that the whole business of the Monteagle letter was a comedy designed to conceal the real method by which the plot was betrayed to the Government.

We have received from the Polish Information Committee a number of useful booklets on the Polish question, including (1) *The Polish Question as an International Problem;* (2) *Landmarks of Polish History*, with an introduction by R. Seton-Watson; (3) *Poland's Struggle for Independence*, with a foreword by Lord Weardale; (4) *Poland as an Independent Economic Unit*, with an introduction by Sidney Webb; (5) *An Outline of the History of Polish Literature*, with a preface by G. P. Gooch; and (6) *The National Music of Poland*. These are published for the Committee by Messrs. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 40 Museum Street, W.C. The Committee also issues from its offices at 110 St. Martin's Lane, W.C., a weekly *Polish News*, gathered from various sources and seldom used by the ordinary Press. These publications should help to popularise a knowledge of what will be the most difficult of all the international problems to be settled after the war, a problem, too, in which history and politics are more than ever intertwined.

Messrs. Longmans send us Dr. Poole's careful and exhaustive *Index* to Vols. XXI.–XXX. of the *English Historical Review* (4s. 6d. net). It runs to seventy-five double-column pages, compared with the fifty-nine pages of the index to the first twenty volumes, which was published ten years ago. The April number of the *Review* contains, as usual, points which teachers of all grades can hardly afford to neglect. Such is the evidence adduced by Mr. W. T. Laprade to rebut the almost universally accepted view that Pitt's

success at the General Election of 1784 represented a popular victory over aristocratic corruption. Mr. Coolidge traces the history of the Col de Tenda; Miss Bradby criticises adversely the authenticity of the letters of Marie Antoinette known as the "Heidenstam Letters," and Dr. Round fixes with considerable probability the date of the Grand Assize.

Sir Arthur Evans, in a paper reprinted from the *Geographical Journal* for April, deals historically and ethnographically, as well as topographically, with "The Adriatic Slavs and the Overland Route to Constantinople." His paper is a valuable addendum to the literature of the Adriatic aspect of the Balkan problem.

The chief items in the *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* are notices of Friends who visited Scotland in the eighteenth century, and a collection of references to Friends in the *Gentleman's Magazine* from 1731 to 1761.

From the "Athenæum" we have received three parts of its *Subject Index to Periodicals* for 1915, which are specially interesting to historical students. The parts, which vary in price from one shilling to eighteenpence, deal with (1) economic and political sciences, law; (2) history, geography, anthropology and folk-lore; and (3) fine arts and archæology. The fact that they are issued at the request of the Council of the Library Association indicates their value and importance, and it remains for students of history to help to justify the Council's request by the frequency with which they demand this index for use at public libraries. The historical section forms an admirable supplement to the Historical Association's *Annual Bulletin*; it would, indeed, be an advantage if the contributors to that *Bulletin* could have this index before them when compiling their accounts. The references to the historical articles and reviews in *The Times* Literary Supplement might with advantage be more frequent.

NEW BOOKS AND NEW EDITIONS.

[Under this head it is proposed to give a list of most of the books dealing with history which have appeared during the preceding quarter, with an indication of the contents when they are not clearly expressed in the title. The references are, unless otherwise stated, to notices in The Times Literary Supplement, *the pages of which are numbered continuously and can therefore be identified without specification of date.]*

INTERCOURSE BETWEEN INDIA AND THE WESTERN WORLD, FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE FALL OF ROME. By H. G. Rawlinson. viii.+196 pp. Cambridge Univ. Press. 7s. 6d. n. P. 268.

THE POLITICAL RELATIONS OF CHRIST'S MINISTRY. By S. Liberty. 182 pp. Milford. 3s. 6d. n. P. 208.

HISTOIRE DES ROMAINS DE TRANSYLVANIE ET DE HONGRIE. Par N. Iorga. 2 vols. Bukarest: J. Göbl. P. 144.

THE LIFE OF ST. BONIFACE. By Willibald. English trs. G. W. Robinson. 114 pp. Harvard University Press. 5s. n. P. 272.

EARLY WORCESTER MSS. Ed. C. H. Turner. 12½×10, lxxii. pp., 32 plates. Clarendon Press. 38s. n. P. 212.

LEBOR GABÁLA. Von A. G. Van Hamel. (Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie, Bd. x, 1 und 2 Heft.) Halle a. S.: Max Niemayer. P. 196.

THE FIRST BATTLE OF MOYTURA (MAG TURED). Ed. and trs. J. Fraser. (Eriu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning.) Dublin. P. 196.

CALENDAR OF THE GORMANSTON REGISTER. Ed. J. Mills, I.S.O., and M. J. McEnery, M.R.I.A. 10½×6½, xix.+252 pp. (Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland.)

CRISES IN THE HISTORY OF THE PAPACY. By Joseph McCabe. 459 pp. Putnam. $2.50 n.

CHRISTIANITY AND POLITICS. By William Cunningham, D.D., F.B.A. 8½×5½, 263 pp. Murray. 6s. n.

This contains the Lowell lectures delivered in the autumn of 1914. They examine the attitude of different Christian denominations in turn towards political life. There is an appendix on "The Attitude of the Church towards War." P. 149.

THE NORMANS IN EUROPEAN HISTORY. By C. H. Haskins. 259 pp. Constable. 8s. 6d. n.

A CATALOGUE OF ENGLISH COINS IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM: THE NORMAN KINGS. By G. C. Brooke. 2 vols. 180 pp. and 62 plates+ 462 pp. £2 n.

A SHORT HISTORY OF JAPAN. By E. W. Clement. 190 pp. Chicago Univ. Press. 4s. n.

GHENKO: THE MONGOL INVASION OF JAPAN (13th C.). By Nakaba Yamada. 277 pp. Smith, Elder. 7s. 6d. n. P. 207.

SIENA: THE STORY OF A MEDIEVAL COMMUNE. By Ferdinand Schevill. New York: Scribner. P. 196.

YEAR BOOKS OF EDWARD II. Vol. XI. 5 Edward II. A.D. 1311—1312. Selden Soc. Ed. W. C. Bolland. xliv.+281 pp. Quaritch.

PUBLIC WORKS IN MEDIÆVAL LAW. Vol. I. (Edw. III. and Richard II.) Selden Soc. Ed. C. T. Flower. 343 pp. Quaritch.

ANTWERP, 1447–1559. By J. Wegg. Bibliography. xix.+359 pp. Methuen. 21s. n. P. 279.

POGGIO'S LIFE AND LETTERS. By E. Walser. Leipzig: Teubner. 16 m. P. 172.

ENGLISH HISTORY IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY AND THE HISTORICAL PLAYS OF SHAKESPEARE. By C. L. Kingsford. Nat. Home Reading Union. 1s. P. 245.

LUTHER. By H. Grisar, S.J. Trs. E. M. Lamond. Ed. Luigi Cappadelta. Vol. V. 606 pp. Kegan Paul. 12s. n.

THE PEARL OF PRINCESSES: MARGUERITE D'ANGOULÊME, QUEEN OF NAVARRE. By H. N. Williams. 423 pp. Nash. 15s. n.

THE FLIGHT OF THE EARLS (1607). By Tadhg O. Cianáin. Ed. Paul Walsh. xx.+268 pp. (Record Soc., Maynooth.) Dublin: M. H. Gill. 3s. 6d. n. P. 296.

A NEW ACCOUNT OF EAST INDIA AND PERSIA: BEING NINE YEARS' TRAVELS, 1672–1681. By John Fryer. Ed. W. Crooke. Vol. III. (Hakluyt Society.) 271 pp. P. 184.

SWIFT'S "CONDUCT OF THE ALLIES." Ed. C. B. Wheeler. vii.+118 pp. Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d. n.

THE PRIMATES OF THE FOUR GEORGES. By A. W. Rowden, K.C. 430 pp. Murray. 12s. n. P. 125. Spectator, p. 662.

REMARKS AND COLLECTIONS OF THOMAS HEARNE. Vol. X., 1728–31. Ed. H. E. Salter. (Oxford Hist. Soc.) 496 pp. Clarendon Press. 21s. P. 280.

ORIGINS OF THE FORTY-FIVE. (Second Series, Vol. II., 1737–46.) Ed. W. B. Blaikie. lxxxviii.+477 pp. Scottish Hist. Soc. P. 281.

ALLAN BREAC STEWART AND HIS ASSOCIATES. By T. Pratt. 47 pp. Sherratt and Hughes. 1s. n.

THE JOURNAL OF CAPTAIN JOHN KNOX. Vol. III. Appendix. 587 pp. Toronto: The Champlain Soc.

JEFFREY AMHERST. By L. S. Mayo. 344 pp. Longmans. 7s. 6d. n. P. 233.

THE LIFE OF HENRY LAURENS. By D. D. Wallace. Putnam. 15s. n. P. 161.

THE JOURNAL OF THE REV. JOHN WESLEY. Vol. VII. (1784–9). Ed. N. Curnock. 528 pp. Kelly. 10s. 6d. n. P. 232.

LORD GRANVILLE LEVESON-GOWER (FIRST EARL GRANVILLE): PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE, 1781–1821. Ed. Castalia, Countess Granville. 2 vols. xxviii.+510+597 pp. Murray. 32s. n. P. 175.

THE LAST DAYS OF THE FRENCH MONARCHY. By H. Belloc. 216 pp. Chapman and Hall. 12s. 6d n. P. 185.

THE CHEVALIER DE BOUFFLERS: A ROMANCE OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. By Nesta H. Webster. xv.+441 pp. Murray. 12s. n. P. 234.

MODERN EUROPE, 1789–1914. By Sydney Herbert. xii.+262 pp. Bibliography. Macmillan. 2s. 6d. n.

A SHORT HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE: FROM THE FRENCH REVOLUTION TO THE GREAT WAR. By E. L. Hasluck. 269 pp. Univ. of London Press. 3s.

HISTORICAL RECORDS OF AUSTRALIA. Series I., Governors' Despatches to and from England. Vol. V., July, 1804–Aug., 1806. 909 pp. Vol. VI., Aug., 1806–Dec., 1808. xxxvii.+80 pp. Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament.

HIST. MSS. COMM.: REPORT ON THE MSS. OF J. B. FORTESCUE, ESQ., PRESERVED AT DROPMORE. Vol. IX., 1807–1809. ci.+567 pp. 2s. 8d. P. 232.

POONA AND ITS BATTLE-FIELDS. By Col. L. W. Shakespeare. 100. p. Macmillan. 5s. n. P. 267.

NATIONALITY AS A FACTOR IN MODERN HISTORY. By J. Holland Rose. 208 pp. Rivingtons. 4s. 6d. n.

GERMANY: 1815–1890. By Sir A. W. Ward. Vol. I., 1815–52. xiv.+591 pp. Bibliography. Cambridge Univ. Press. 12s. n. P. 302.

TREITSCHKE'S HISTORY OF GERMANY IN THE 19th CENTURY. Vol. II. Trs. E. and C. Paul. 724 pp. Jarrold. 12s. 6d. n P. 254.

POLITICS. By H. von Treitschke. Trs. Blanche Dugdale and T. de Bille. Introduction by the Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour. 2 vols. xliii.+406+643 pp. Constable. 24s. n. P. 283.

THE LIFE OF ANDREW JACKSON. By J. S. Bassett. Vol. I. New Edition. The Macmillan Co. 10s. 6d. n.

THE LIFE OF BENJAMIN DISRAELI, EARL OF BEACONSFIELD. Vol. IV., 1855-68. By G. E. Buckle. Murray. 12s. n. Pp. 217, 285. Spectator, p. 606.

THE LIFE OF LORD ROBERTS. By Sir George Forrest. Popular Edition. xii.+380 pp. Cassell. 2s. 6d. n.

A SHORT HISTORY OF ENGLISH RURAL LIFE. By M. Fordham. xvi.+183 pp. Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d. n. P. 248.

THE LAW OF THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION. By the Hon. W. H. P. Clement. 3rd Edition. 1099 pp. Sweet and Maxwell. £2 2s. n.

EARLY DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO. By W. R. Mannings. 406 pp. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

EMPIRE AND ARMAMENT: THE EVOLUTION OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM. By J. C. Wise. 353 pp. Putnam. 6s. n.

JAPANESE EXPANSION AND AMERICAN POLICIES. By J. F. Abbott. viii.+267 pp. The Macmillan Co. 6s. 6d. n.

THE ANNUAL REGISTER, 1915. New Series. 360+196 pp. Longmans. 16s. n. P. 158.

CURRENT HISTORY AND POLITICS.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS. By various writers. 207 pp. Macmillan. 2s. n. P. 207.

GERMANY BEFORE THE WAR. By Baron Beyens. Trs. P. V. Cohn. 366 pp. Nelson. 3s. 6d. n.

THE GERMANS. By J. M. Robertson, M.P. Williams and Norgate. 7s. 6d. net. Spectator, p. 550.

THE ASSAULT: GERMANY BEFORE THE OUTBREAK AND ENGLAND IN WAR-TIME. By F. W. Wile. Heinemann. 6s. n. P. 183.

TWENTY YEARS IN BAGHDAD AND SYRIA: SHOWING GERMANY'S BID FOR THE MASTERY OF THE EAST. By Canon J. T. Parfit (Chaplain in Jerusalem). 122 pp. Simpkin, Marshall. 1s. n.

LA SYRIE DE DEMAIN. Par N. Moutran. Plon-Nourrit. 6f. P. 216.

THE DIPLOMACY OF THE GREAT WAR. By A. Bullard. xii.+344 pp. Bibliography. The Macmillan Co. 6s. 6d. n.

THE EMPIRE AND THE WAR: SUMMARY OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION BY THE PARLIAMENTS OF THE EMPIRE. By H. d'Egville. (The Empire Parliamentary Assoc.) 2s. 6d. P. 248.

NELSON'S HISTORY OF THE WAR. Vols. XI., XII. By John Buchan. 245 pp. Nelson. 1s. 3d. n. each.

A YEAR AGO: EYE-WITNESS'S NARRATIVE, 30 March–18 July, 1915. By Lt.-Col. E. D. Swinton and Capt. the Earl Percy. 217 pp. Arnold. 2s. n.

NOTRE ÉPOPÉE, 1914 – 1915: RECITS OFFICIELS DES COMBATS. Société française d'Imprimerie. 3·50f. P. 120.

BELGIANS UNDER THE GERMAN EAGLE. By Jean Massart. Trs. B. Miall. 368 pp. Fisher Unwin. 10s. 6d. n. P. 291.

L'ÉPOPÉE SERBE (1915). Par H. Barby. Berger-Levrault. 3·50f. P. 202.

L'ANGLETERRE ET LA GUERRE. Par C. Cestre. Didier. 3·50f. P. 144.

LA GUERRE ET L'ITALIE. Par J. Bainville. Fayard. 3·50f. P. 278.

LA GUERRE (Lectures by MM. E. Bourgeois, L. Renaud, and R. G. Lévy, and General Malleterre). F. Alcan. 3·50f. P. 120.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF NEUTRALS. By D. C. Brewer. 260 pp. Putnam. 5s. n.

THE GROTIUS SOCIETY (Founded 1915). PROBLEMS OF THE WAR: Papers read before the Society in the year 1915. Vol. I. 104 pp. Sweet and Maxwell. 5s. n. P. 104.

TREATIES, THEIR MAKING AND ENFORCEMENT. By S. B. Crandall, Ph.D. 2nd Edition. xxxii.+663 pp. Washington: Byrne.

"THE DAY" — AND AFTER. Speeches of the Rt. Hon. W. M. Hughes. Introduction by the Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd George. 177. pp. Cassell. 1s. n.

POLITICAL AND LITERARY ESSAYS. 3rd Series. By the Earl of Cromer. viii.+334 pp. Macmillan. 10s. 6d. n. P. 257.

INTER ARMA: BEING ESSAYS WRITTEN IN TIME OF WAR. By Edmund Gosse. 248 pp. Heinemann. 6s. n. P. 197.

THE EUROPEAN ANARCHY. By G. Lowes Dickinson. 153 pp. Allen and Unwin. 2s. 6d. n. P. 219.

DU DROIT DE LA FORCE À LA FORCE DU DROIT. Par Prof. Edgard Milhaud. Geneva: Atar. 1f. P. 132.

"Traces the history of the movement for a limitation of armaments and the work of The Hague Conference."

PHILOSOPHY AND WAR. By E. Boutroux. Authorised translation by F. Rothwell. 212 pp. Constable. 4s. 6d. n. P. 233.

RELIGION IN EUROPE AND THE WORLD CRISIS. By C. E. Osborne. Fisher Unwin. 7s. 6d. n. P. 188.

THE GERMAN SOUL IN ITS ATTITUDE TOWARDS ETHICS AND CHRISTIANITY, THE STATE, AND WAR. By Baron F. von Hügel. 223 pp. Dent. 2s. 6d. n. P. 222.

THE SUPER-STATE AND THE "ETERNAL VALUES." By Mark Baldwin, LL.D. 38 pp. Clarendon Press. 1s. 6d. n.

ARISTODEMOCRACY. From the Great War Back to Moses, Christ, and Plato. By Sir C. Waldstein. xviii.+434 pp. Murray. 10s. 6d. n. Pp. 255.

THE PROBLEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH. Ed. L. Curtis. xii.+248 pp. Macmillan. 1s. 6d. P. 241.

IMPERIAL UNITY AND THE DOMINIONS. By A. B. KEITH. 626 pp. Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d. P. 195.

THE EMPIRE ON THE ANVIL. By W. B. WORSFOLD. Preface by LORD SYDENHAM. xv.+242 pp. Smith, Elder. 6s. n. P. 230.

"THE TIMES" BOOK OF RUSSIA. With an Introduction by SIR DONALD MACKENZIE WALLACE. 2s. n. P. 174.

SWEDEN. Historical and Statistical Handbook. By order of the Swedish Government. Ed. J. GUINCHARD. 2 vols. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt and Sons. 25 kroner. P. 122.

AMERICAN DIPLOMACY. By CARL R. FISH, Professor of History in the University of Wisconsin. 8½×5½, 541 pp. New York: Holt. London: Bell. 10s. 6d. n.

AMERICAN NEUTRALITY. By J. M. BALDWIN. 138 pp. Putnam. 2s. n. P. 158.

THE NEW FREEDOM. By WOODROW WILSON. 288 pp. Dent. 1s. n. P. 243.

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND MAJORITY RULE. By E. ELLIOTT. 175 pp. Princeton Univ. Press. 5s. 6d. n.

LOCAL HISTORY.

THE PLACE-NAMES OF DURHAM. By C. E. JACKSON. 115 pp. Allen and Unwin. 6s. n. P. 239.

THE PLACE-NAMES OF HEREFORDSHIRE. By A. T. BANNISTER. 231 pp. The Author, The Close, Hereford. 12s. 6d. n. Pp. 113, 141.

LONDON TOPOGRAPHICAL RECORD. Vol. X., including the 15th Annual Report of the London Topographical Society. 195 pp. Chiswick Press.

LONDON PAST AND PRESENT. (Special Winter Number of *The Studio*, 1915–16.) 11½×8, 194 pp. Four maps. *The Studio* Office. 5s. n. P. 139.

APPENDIX TO RYE'S INDEX TO NORFOLK TOPOGRAPHY. ROMAN CAMPS AND REMAINS IN NORFOLK. NORWICH HOUSES IN 1600. By W. RYE (Rye's Norfolk Hand Lists). Norwich: Roberts.

THE CHURCHES OF NORFOLK. Hundred of Diss. By T. HUGH BRYANT. 322 pp. (Norfolk and Norwich Archæological Society.) P. 124.

A CARTULARY OF THE HOSPITAL OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST. Vol. II. Edited by H. E. SALTER. (Oxford Historical Soc.) 467 pp. Clarendon Press. 21s.

WARWICKSHIRE. By J. HARVEY BLOOM. 144 pp. Cambridge Univ. Press. 1s. 6d. n.

VISITORS' GUIDE TO WESTMINSTER ABBEY. By FRANCIS BOND. Second Edition [revised]. 94 pp. XXXII. Plates. Milford. 1s. n.

THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE EAST RIDING ANTIQUARIAN SOC. Vol. XXI. xiv.+128 pp. Hull: A. Brown. 10s. 6d. n.

THE EVOLUTION OF AN ENGLISH TOWN: Being the Story of . . . Pickering, in Yorkshire, from Prehistoric Times to . . . 1905. By GORDON HOME. (New Edition.) 299 pp. Dent. 3s. 6d. n.

SCHOOL-BOOKS.

DENT'S SCHOOL PAMPHLETS: Senior: 1, Race and Region, 2, Britain and the World Conquerors; 3, Sons of the Blood. Ed. R. WILSON, D.Litt., F.R.G.S. 64 pp. each. 5½d. each. Educ. Supplt., p. 66.

OUTLINES OF EUROPEAN HISTORY, 1814–1914. By G. B. SMITH. 267 pp. Arnold. 2s. 6d. Educ. Supplt., p. 54.

A SYLLABUS IN WAR GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY. By A. A. COCK. 32 pp. G. Philip and Son. 6d. n.

THE FIRST YEAR OF THE GREAT WAR. By R. WILSON, D.Litt. W. and R. Chambers. 1s. 6d. n. Educ. Supplt., p. 66.

E. J. D.

ARCHIVE

IMPERIAL UNITY AND THE DOMINIONS. By A. B. Keith. 626 pp. Clarendon Press. 32s. 6d. P. 195.

THE EMPIRE ON THE ANVIL. By W. B. Worsfold. Preface by Lord Sydenham. xv+242 pp. Smith, Elder. 6s. n. P. 230.

"THE TIMES" BOOK OF RUSSIA. With an Introduction by Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace. 2s. n. P. 174.

SWEDEN. Historical and Statistical Handbook. By order of the Swedish Government. Ed. J. Guinchard. 2 vols. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt and Sons. 25 kroner. P. 122.

AMERICAN DIPLOMACY. By Carl R. Fish, Professor of History in the University of Wisconsin. 8½×5½, 341 pp. New York: Holt. London: Hall. 10s. 6d. n.

AMERICAN NEUTRALITY. By J. M. Baldwin. 133 pp. Putnam. 2s. n. P. 153.

THE NEW FREEDOM. By Woodrow Wilson. 288 pp. Dent. 1s. n. P. 240.

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND MAJORITY RULE. By E. Elliott. 175 pp. Princeton Univ. Press. 5s. 6d. n.

LOCAL HISTORY.

THE PLACE-NAMES OF DURHAM. By C. E. Johnson. 115 pp. Allen and Unwin. 5s. n. P. 239.

THE PLACE-NAMES OF HEREFORDSHIRE. By A. T. Bannister. 234 pp. The Author, The Close, Hereford. 12s. 6d. n. Pp. 113, 141.

LONDON TOPOGRAPHICAL RECORD. Vol. X., including the 18th Annual Report of the London Topographical Society. 135 pp. Chiswick Press.

LONDON PAST AND PRESENT. (Special Winter Number of *The Studio*, 1915–16.) 11½×8. 104 pp. Four maps. *The Studio* Office. 5s. n. P. 139.

APPENDIX TO RYE'S INDEX TO NORFOLK TOPOGRAPHY, ROMAN CAMPS AND REMAINS IN NORFOLK, NORWICH HOUSES IN 1600. By W. Rye (Rye's Norfolk Hand Lists). Norwich: Roberts.

THE CHURCHES OF NORFOLK. Hundred of Diss. By T. Hugh Bryant. 322 pp. (Norfolk and Norwich Archæological Society.) P. 124.

A CARTULARY OF THE HOSPITAL OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST. Vol. II. Edited by H. E. Salter. (Oxford Historical Soc.) 457 pp. Clarendon Press. 21s.

WARWICKSHIRE. By J. Hastey Bloom. 144 pp. Cambridge Univ. Press. 1s. 6d. n.

VISITORS' GUIDE TO WESTMINSTER ABBEY. By Francis Bond. Second Edition [revised]. 96 pp. XXXII. Plates. Milford. 1s. n.

THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE EAST RIDING ANTIQUARIAN SOC. Vol. XXI. xiv+123 pp. Hull: A. Brown. 10s. 6d. n.

THE EVOLUTION OF AN ENGLISH TOWN: Being the Story of . . . Pickering, in Yorkshire, from Prehistoric Times to . . . 1905. By Gordon Home. (New Edition.) 290 pp. Dent. 3s. 6d. n.

SCHOOL-BOOKS.

DENT'S SCHOOL PAMPHLETS: Series: 1. Race and Region, 2. Britain and the World Conquerors; 3. Sons of the Blood. Ed. R. Wilson, D.Litt., F.R.G.S. 64 pp. each. 2d. each. Educ. Supplt., p. 56.

OUTLINES OF EUROPEAN HISTORY, 1914–1916. By G. R. Smith. 367 pp. Arnold. 2s. 6d. Educ. Supplt., p. 54.

A SYLLABUS IN WAR GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY. By A. A. Cock. 32 pp. G. Philip and Son. 6d. n.

THE FIRST YEAR OF THE GREAT WAR. By R. Wilson, D.Litt., W. and R. Chambers. 1s. 6d. n. Educ. Supplt., p. 56.

E. J. D.